

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1906.

---

## ARTICLE I.

FREE WILL. AUGSBURG CONFESSION ARTICLE XVIII.\*

BY PROFESSOR M. COOVER, D.D.

"Concerning free will they teach, that the human will possesses some liberty for the performance of civil duties, and for the choice of those things subject to reason. But it does not possess the power, without the influence of the Holy Spirit, of fulfilling the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness; for the natural man receiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God: But this is accomplished in the heart, when the Holy Spirit is received through the word. The same is declared by Augustine in so many words: "We confess that all men have a free will, which possesses the judgment of reason, by which they cannot indeed, without the divine aid, either begin or certainly accomplish, what is becoming in things relating to God; but only in works of the present life, as well good as evil. In good works, I say, which arise from our natural goodness, such as to choose to labor in the field, to eat and drink, to choose to have a friend, to have clothing, to build a house, to take a wife, to feed cattle, to learn various and useful arts, or to do any good thing relative to this life; all which things, however, do not exist without the divine government; yea, they exist and begin to be from Him and through Him.

And in evil works (men have a free will), such as to choose to worship an idol, to will to commit murder, etc."

\* Holman Lecture, delivered in the Gettysburg Seminary Chapel, May 8, 1906.

They condemn the Pelagians, and others, who teach that we are able, by the mere powers of nature, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to love God above all things, and to do His commands, as to the substance of our actions. For, although nature may be able, after a certain manner, to perform external actions, such as to abstain from theft, from murder, etc., yet it cannot perform the inner motions, such as the fear of God, faith in God, chastity, patience, etc."

The mental diversion of men today rarely finds its play in dissertations on free will. The practical force of will now prevails and finds exercise in material products and achievements. We are not disposed as Milton's fallen angels, who

Sat on hill retired  
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high  
Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,  
Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute.

Fallen man today is scarcely in sympathy with abstruse divertisements. The tedium of this our strenuous life is rarely sought to be dispelled by metaphysical exercises. The practical science of today, however, that so engrosses us, may sometime be as dull, prolix, and unprofitable to our remote descendants. But old subjects return yoked together with new aspects of the same old unanswered problems. We are passing from a dogmatic to an ethical era, from an arrogant to an eclectic philosophy, from a departmental conception of the constitution of man to a more adequate psychological view of his unitary personality. Life without ethical ends is life without reason, and ethics is found to be in a realm of pauperism if there be no such thing as free will. It is the ethical bearing of free will that gives it its present importance.

When the whole of man is resolved into physical nature, and when moral restraints, reproofs, and punishments, as well as ethical appreciations and approvals, are deemed mere utilitarian products in man's evolution, the ascribing of virtue and moral worth to heredity and environment results in moral paralysis. The determination of life and conduct on a purely materialistic basis lowers humanity to a mere link in an endless

chain of evolution, and results in lax morals, lax business integrity, and flabby character.

To meet a science which is an imperfect classification of knowledge, because not giving due importance to all observable factors, another science must be coördinated which satisfies to a greater degree the unsolved problems of man's ethical being. Religion influences thought as well as it affects feeling and action, and every age brings forward some new reflective aspects of religious problems. Things contemplated in an intelligible and systematic manner become science.

The materials of religious science are divine and transcendental; the forms of religious science are human. But the human method of analysis and synthesis of transcendental themes is necessary for a clear and consecutive view of religious subjects. God makes flowers; man makes botany, and the science of botany enables us to understand flowers. Philosophy guards the relations of thought to the method; fixes the lines of analytic and synthetic procedure, and gives a rational product. A thing may be rational, yet not rationalistic. Rightly and clearly to understand, we must cognize and compare, consider and digest. Science is knowledge classified. What is theologically true cannot be philosophically false. There is such a thing as scientific orthodoxy.

Freedom of will is both psychological and metaphysical. The will to act, the power to cause decisions, is a psychological function, is psychological freedom. Metaphysical freedom means that the will that causes decisions has itself no cause; that it is impelled or influenced by no anterior cause or antecedent event. That man causes decisions is not doubted, but that the actions of man's will are absolutely uncaused is much debated. Is man's will a real *agens*, a first cause, or is there some anterior influence antecedent to his moral choice? The failure to distinguish between psychological and metaphysical freedom has been the cause of endless controversy among theologians.

A man religiously influenced by prevenient influences from God acts and chooses by psychological freedom, and is not a first cause of his moral change. The will to be spiritual is not

Judson Quarterly  
Vol. 19, No. 3

without antecedent grace, not without divine illumination of his intellect.

Pelagianism makes man spiritually and morally his own creator by regarding him as acting from choices which he has willed without anterior spiritual causes. Metaphysical freedom of will in man makes him an agent of first cause.

Evil came into actual being as sin through man's metaphysical freedom. God made Adam free to choose between good and evil and thus to initiate character, and to become a moral being, which was alone possible by virtue of independent and uncaused action of personal will. The act of bad choice on the part of Adam has become a habit in the human race. What science calls heredity, theology in part calls original sin. The moral quality as well as physical tendencies of Adam descend to his offspring. An anterior cause, a proclivity to evil, gives man but the power of psychological freedom of the will. He is now not absolutely an *agens*, but *agitur* in moral conduct. This, however, does not excuse him of his evil conduct. He still has freedom of choice. The end which a self-conscious subject presents to itself is regulative of his action, and the consequences of his action entail responsibility.

To view the subject of free will in its manifold implications, the theological aspect must be unfolded from its interconnections with other sciences. Religion is the mother of philosophy. The contemplation of the unseen Infinite and Absolute begets wonder. Plato says philosophy begins in wonder. Man is a religious being because he is conscious of relations to unseen powers, and his religion sustains a vital relation to all his classified knowledge. Material science, metaphysics, psychology, and ethics, must be reckoned with in their interrelations in the consideration of religion, as well as of theology.

#### 1. THE NATURALISTIC ASPECT OF FREE WILL.

The desire of the human mind to systematize and classify all knowledge and to bring it into unity has fostered a mechanical scheme of nature. Nature is orderly in its procedure, and unvarying antecedent and consequent in the conduct of natural



forces has given the concept of law. But this law is not a causal force; it is only a name given to the orderliness observed in the conduct of nature. Natural law is not a force, but a formula; a generalization describing the orderly action of nature as manifested in the behavior of bodies. This sense of order has systematized all forces both of matter and of mind, and developed an empirical system all inclusive. Inference deducted from a clear comprehension of parts has led to the acceptance of the conviction that the whole is formed by the same determinative plan. Successive departments of human knowledge have been bound together under the feeling of certainty that there is a logical as well as natural unity to be reached by this method. Scientific success confirms the procedure so that the belief grows in extent and in intensity of conviction. The unity and uniformity of nature has become a settled conclusion since it was propounded by the great minds of the eighteenth century.

The psychological and moral elements of man's nature are included in this all-embracing system. Man is a product of natural forces, a being characterized in his personality partly by heredity, partly by his own past action, partly by physical forces of environment. His will like his self-consciousness is a complex manifestation of material elements, and the law of causality is as absolute for mind as for matter.

It is expected that the movements and history of men may be predicted, after fuller knowledge of psychological forces, with the precision by which planetary movements are calculated.

The current of modern psychology is strongly borne in the direction of materialism. Thought is analyzed as molecular movements of the brain. Consciousness is inextricably bound up with matter; soul is a relic of an outworn and abandoned terminology; and conscience is a metaphysical surplusage.

But it is discerned that the materialist who affirms that matter is the whole of existence, and that but a mode of motion, utters a paradox. His very assertion lifts him out of the category of thing into that of thought, and if thought is but a mode of motion it is an escape valve through which

energy is dissipated without any resultant transmutation into continued modal energy. The saying of Cabanis that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile is proved a false psychology.

And after approved psychology comes ethics whereby it is discovered that the moral sentiments of indignation against, and responsibility for, crime, and the right of punishment, have no logical foundation in society if there be no moral freedom. Moral restraints and retributions are unjustifiable apart from moral responsibility.

Attempts may be made to cover up the gross features of bald materialism by agnosticism, but the answer or lack of answer does not long satisfy the sensible and inquisitive mind. Something more than sublimated matter must be called into play for brain-power and thought-process; and chemical changes can scarcely produce conscience.

There is no loss of energy in its transitional forms of transmutation in the pure order of nature, and if mere physical or nerve energy can pass into thought there must result a loss in the sum of the world's physical force. A mode of motion converted into thought involves the loss of physical energy, and the gradual but sure diminution of forces which have the power of refunding their energy into other forms. Thought is not a precipitate, and if purely physical antecedents effect mental consequents, matter becomes a vanishing quantity, and its essential law of the conservation of energy is nullified.

To avoid this the "preëstablished harmony" of Leibnitz in the inter-action of matter and mind may come in the new dress of psycho-physical monism, or the "double aspect" theory. But this does not solve the problem; it just adds another. Thing and thought are not two sides of the same thing. The gulf that is fixed between thought and thing cannot be bridged by a parallelism. Mental and molecular harmony is not an undivorced unity. If they constitute a unity, if thought and thing are identical, they are one, and one is not a harmony. Symphony implies parts distinct but blending. If thought and thing are two, they are not one. There

is an absolute dualism in their existence, or they are identical, and if identical, which is real, matter, or spirit? Thus we are again divided into two camps of philosophy. We are purely materialists, or purely spiritualists. We must choose between Haeckel and Hegel. When the material element of combined thought and thing is accentuated, we have materialism predominant, and the "double aspect" becomes empirically binocular; and when the thought element is accentuated the monism passes into transcendentalism, and we have spiritualistic pantheism.

Thus the psycho-physical theory resolves itself through the predilection of its advocates into materialism, or idealism. In neither of these conceptions of being is man truly free as a personality, nor is free will a discoverable factor. The infinity and eternity of matter bewilders us, and the illusion of matter and sole existence of spirit eviscerates our empirical existence, and evaporates our personality. If matter is the whole of being, our refunding is spiritual annihilation; if spirit is the whole of existence, if we are but an evanescent expression of God in our fleeting illusory experience, our refunding is the loss of self conscious personality; death brings to an end the continuity of self-consciousness. Though we sit apart retired, and "reason high" of

"Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,"

we seeking find no end, "in wondering mazes lost." We are, at most, free to speculate, or to view all as a necessitous dream.

Sidgwick in his *Methods of Ethics* gives a suppositional case of possible danger in free will. Suppose all the planets were endowed with free will, and could exercise the power of resistance to the centripetal and centrifugal forces which keep the universe in equilibrium and order, would not our confidence in the stability of nature be impaired and somewhat shaken? Astronomical calculations would have to be ventured on with reservation, and be limited by conditional considerations. Astronomy must then cease to be an exact science. But this argu-

ment is more specious than logical. Planets, too, have their aberrations, and cause damage. We are occasionally smitten by a meteorite from some planetary world. If wrong were forever on the throne, we could prognosticate no social status. But the realm of freedom has its major part in righteousness. Through moral harmony thus made generally dominant we can predict human conditions, and compose a reliable social science.

Professor Sidgwick, while recognizing the benefits to the moral world of the acceptance of the principle of free will, sees another formidable difficulty. It is difficult to conceive of a world thoroughly under governmental rule in which an indefinite number of free wills operate as original causes. But here Professor Sidgwick confuses metaphysical with psychological free will. And if he includes the difficulty under psychological freedom, there is a solution of it. The difficulty dissolves itself when history shows that a minority who are righteously animated by good moral sentiment carry with them the obedience of the many through their sense of moral approval of the good, if not by practical conformity through willing conduct. Wills need not be an absolute unit for government. So great is right that its possession and practice by a minority compels respect and compliance, and effects obedience to its mandates. The rule of right is not necessarily the rule of the majority, much less of a unitary society. The very force of freedom lies in the rights and ethics of man, and is rooted in the ground of invincible truth. Though we may forecast men's conduct, and prophesy future conditions of society, and at length find discrepancies in the fulfillment, yet we do not attribute our miscalculation to the free wills of the individuals, but to our lack of knowledge respecting their circumstances, character, and impulses. We feel free to calculate because free wills are constrained by social laws and moral factors, which are normally computable. The consideration of moral forces is reasonable, because their effects are calculable. We do not ignore free will, but reckon free will in harmony with social right. Free wills in moral government are calculable factors from a law of order created by freedom itself. The

law of nature is selfish segregation; the law of society is the sense of duty and social obligation. It is only a free agent that will refuse to follow the line of the least resistance and assume hardships for altruistic ends. Freedom is the exponent of man as a personality, the following of a conscious end or idea, and not the *entia imaginationis* of Spinoza.

The social aspect of freedom forces into consideration the expression in practical and concrete forms of merit and demerit in society. If man be a mere child of nature, a being characterized by causes and forces anterior to his self-consciousness, merit and demerit in his conduct are irrelevant sentiments. It smacks of misplaced sentiment to praise and reward a man for conduct due to mere fortuitous circumstances; and it would be repugnant to our sensibilities to blame and punish him for actions due to necessity expressed in the concurrence of accidental events or in the force of environment.

A man does not reproach himself for his congenital blindness but when he reproaches himself for choosing the good with feebleness and the bad with avidity, he distinguishes himself from physical nature, and places himself in the moral sphere. A man may feel sorry for his hereditary blemish, but it does not rest on his conscience.

Kant affirms that freedom is a necessary postulate of morality. The moral consciousness is dissolved by a naturalistic or deterministic explanation of man's relation to obligation. A system of necessity may manufacture some utilitarian scheme to help society out of difficulties of moral disorder, but such a system finds no adequate basis for personal responsibility. Remorse is a misanthropic delusion of a sensitive conscience; regret is not a healthy attitude of mind for animal spirits and strenuous buoyancy; and disapproval of wrong is not reasonable if the agent of folly be not free. If man is engulfed in the law of necessity there can be no free obedience, and no moral sentiments. Approbation is but ephemeral feeling without moral content; social or industrial wrong is coincident with unchangeable law and outside the province of accountability. What ought to be is, and the actual is the only possible exist-

ence. The actual and the possible are identical, and to think otherwise is squeamish sentimentalism.

But is the self accusing of the wrong doer an error in nature, a mere by-product, an artificial expression of aberrant matter? The sense of right and wrong is here, and is the most healthy factor in the preservation of forces which make social life possible. If the moral sense be abnormal, how has it become an approved and permanent law in the intelligent world? The conception of oughtness is certainly more healthy than the conception of helplessness, and of fatal submission to environment. If the moral sense is capable not only of self-assertion, but as well of forceful operation, nature has within her system a constitutional principle traceable in fact and history. How so powerful an illusion as that of moral duty, and of personal freedom to comply or resist, could dominate a moral world for generations, and produce the highest product of human achievement in thought and in social dynamics, and yet have no ground of positive and factual existence, passes comprehension. Errors have their day and pass away, but good things founded in eternal truth are here to stay. Only the self-consistent truth is abiding, all else must fade away.

The supreme category of life is freedom. If freedom be but a healthy illusion, productive of economic and utilitarian good, illusion then is the factual force of the world's true progress. But to be awake, to dispel the dream, nature should assert its truth and strip off this illusion. Then to be sane in the factual world is to be unmoral. But the sense of freedom, with its accompanying consciousness of right and duty, is no historic excrescence on the body politic. The health of the body depends on the moral feelings.

Praise and blame, reward and punishment, are expressions of a healthy world, of a world seeking its health by the only possible curative appliances. Criminal jurisprudence is preventive of governmental mortification, a medicinal aid to the vigor of buoyant moral life. The relation of law to crime is a psychological handling of human responsibility and amenability to social right and duty.

The judge does not inquire how a criminal came to be what he is, but judges him for what he is and what he does. It is psychological freedom that makes man responsible for his conduct, not the metaphysical freedom misused by Adam. Man is held accountable for his actions however the anterior forces that made him what he is may have entered into the constitution of his moral state. Practical jurisprudence has nothing to do with the metaphysics of choice, but proceeds on the indubitable fact of psychological freedom of choice. The will to act is sufficient ground for accountability, and the judge does not inquire into the will to will.

But spiritual religion has a law written in the heart, and seeks to effect a quality of life above mere orderliness through fear of punishment. In this realm of thought metaphysical freedom has become a vital subject in the consideration of man's spiritual birth and regeneration.

## II. THE METAPHYSICS OF FREE WILL.

The law of causality is a universal law of nature. Causes with calculable consequences are reckoned in every department of material existence. The conduct of nature can be qualitatively and quantitatively computed. Man is a part of the great whole of nature, and his conduct comes under the same law of necessity. There can be no release of man from this necessary order, else there would be a hiatus in the system of the universe.

But man seemingly has free will. Is it an illusion, or an essential and real factor in his constitution as a man? If man be purely a creature of necessity his conduct is not subject to moral blame or approval. Kant says if there be no liberty, there is no morality. To be free is to possess the power to initiate movement, that is, to be a first cause. But if man have the power to initiate movements by force of will, there is introduced into nature a factor that breaks the series of events in natural causation. Either man is free, or there can be no morality; or if he be free, there is a rupture in the law of natural causality.



Kant seeks to solve the antinomy by a distinction between the intelligible world and the sensible empirical world. Things as they are in themselves are unknown; they are noumena; things as they are seen and experienced are phenomena. In the intelligible noumenal world man is free; in the empirical phenomenal world he is subject to necessity. Time and space are conditions of man's empirical experience, and in this experience he is under the law of necessity. But in the intelligible world, the world of pure thought and being, space and time are not factors in causality. In the noumenal state where time and space are not conditions of experience there is freedom. With God there is no past or future, Eternity is all present to him. His is a pure noumenal existence. There is a state of man's being before he becomes subject to the conditions of time and space, in which intelligible world he is free. The noumenal man then is free, but man in his empirical states in the sensible world is subject to the law of necessity. He is free in principle noumenally, but under necessity phenomenally. Man has the power of initiative, the ability to generate new and free movements in his intelligible or noumenal existence. But intelligible causation is not a matter of phenomenal experience. Such causation can not be known, but it can be thought. In the intelligible world freedom is a possibility; for morality freedom is a necessity. If freedom be possible and necessary, then it must be actual. Thus in an apodictic manner freedom is proved or thought to be proved real. Pure reason leaves the existence of freedom a problem; the practical reason seeks to solve it in the demand for morality. If pure reason does not absolutely negative the possibility of free will, the demand of the practical reason cannot be ignored, hence the apodictic result is that man is free and responsible as a moral agent.

But the Kantian logic gives no freedom to man as a phenomenal being in a sensible world. When and where has man a conscious state to experience moral choice or to acquire a moral trend before he is born into this world of natural causation? We are conscious of no previous state in which freedom is acquired or imparted as a principle. The character of every



man is the product of heredity, experience, and environment. He is not free before his natal existence. Parental life anterior to his own has formed and characterized his disposition. Man is the child of anterior forces, the collected product of circumstance and heredity, and is reducible to the cosmical forces which have made and characterized him. An adequate knowledge of the universe resolves man into the constituent elements of his being and character. Matter is the all of empirical phenomena, and mind is a complex manifestation of intelligible and empirical forces. A phenomenal existence can be refunded into its antecedents, and these exhibit its nature. In the sensible world man is resolvable into his experience. Human nature is a part of the totality of things, a phase of the universal order. Man is simply a part of the universe itself. The universal order admits of no exceptions; planets, minds, and moral sentiments, are successive states of evolution, and there is no independence of nature given to any part. Man is a compound of inner forces of disposition and character, and external forces of environment and circumstance. The outer force is larger, vastly more extensive than the inner, and hence the more determinative of man's being. The play of his mind is but a momentary ripple on the surface of forces which have been in action for countless ages, making him what he is. His motives come to him already formed, the strongest of which determines the choice. The prevalence and power of that predominant motive depends on the person's character, and the character on the results of previous prevalent motives, the quality and nature of which have been characterized by experiences which antedate his own conscious life. His conduct, whether physical or moral, is the joint result of character and circumstance, and these are reducible directly or indirectly to combinations of sequences of anterior natural forces.

Kant admits no hiatus in the empirical world of causation. But man's empirical experience does not begin with birth, or with personal consciousness. Parents and ancestors through ages of geneological development have been factors in forming his character and personality. No noumenal state has been

personally his in which to exercise free will outside of space and time. He is resolved back into Adam, and Adam came already formed from the hand of God. The conditions of time and space have been his only state in his conscious life, and these conditions have been unbroken since man was formed. If Adam came into being as man from anterior animal and other physical factors in the unbroken order of natural evolution, Kant's intelligible state of noumenal existence is resolved back into God as the First Cause. The First Cause, God himself, is alone the noumenal state in which free will finds play.

The Hegelian philosophy has logically carried out the scheme of Kantian metaphysics and resolved man into a higher necessity, into God. In the Hegelian system man's personality is his character; his character is his intelligible reason; the intelligible reason is the divine immanence, and man as a spiritual being is depersonalized into God. The materialist resolves man into natural forces and elements, so that he is logically depersonalized into nature. The Hegelian resolves man into an expression of the divine being, and depersonalizes him into the Absolute. Man is refunded into nature and is absolutely subjected to the lower necessity by the materialist; he is refunded into God, the higher necessity, by the Hegelian. This is the Scylla and Charybdis of metaphysics. Christianity has never been allied with the former, but it is allied with the latter. Neo-Kantianism does not escape the Hegelian metaphysics, nor does Ritschlianism in its abjuration of philosophy become unmetaphysical. Man as a spiritual being is resolved into God, however his empirical experience may be handled.

Predestination is in principle allied with this phase of philosophy and metaphysics. The logical consequences of development end in the same conclusion. Man is so minimized and depersonalized as to the free action of his will that he becomes a pliable irresistible subject of divine forces impressed upon him. He is thus placed outside the realm of personal morality, and made a mere creature of an all-inclusive divine action and control.

Transcendentalism attempts a solution of freedom in a time-

less state anterior to physical causation expressed in phenomena, and in the attempt resolves the whole of man's spiritual being back into God. To preserve man's personality distinct, an adequate theology must recognize the properties of man as a rational being. Prevenient grace characters man's intellect through divine illumination. The Spirit of God comes into contact with man, but leaves man's faculties distinct while he spiritualizes man's powers. But Hegelianism explains man's rational and spiritual personality as an aspect or expression of God in man. The Hegelian transcendentalist sees in the development of the cosmos the evolution of divine reason making its manifestation in man, so that man's reasoning intelligence and God are identical. Thus man is resolved into a higher necessity, and is determined and characterized by divine immanence and is a part of God. Man's freedom thus viewed is but a manifestation of a divine factor in him, a derived, and not a native property of personality. Theological predestination is an aspect of irresistible divine action, in, as well as upon, man, a kind of determination that depersonalizes virtue and character through the caprice of the unaccountable secret will of God. Man is thus a chosen vessel for God to display himself in and to manifest his personal will. The difficulty for theology in the recognition of the Supreme Being is to maintain human individuality and moral accountability as real and not as a mere appearance; to vindicate for man a true moral personality and not evacuate him as a passive instrument or vehicle of divine energy. As Professor Seth says, "For, after all, the chief guarantee of a worthy view of God is a worthy view of man. To maintain the reality of the moral life must give us in the end a higher view of God, as well as enable us to conceive the possibility of a higher union with Him—the union and communion not only of thought with Thought, but of will with Will" (*A Study of Ethical Principles*. p. 387).

Hegelian pantheism results from overstress being laid on the divine Being and action in relation to man's moral and spiritual origin and life. The peculiar relations of theological determinism have close affinities with transcendental schemes which de-

personalize man and make his freedom a mere appearance. There are theologians who denounce the Hegelian philosophy as pantheistic and godless, who hug the theology that is born of the same conception.

In the light of the foregoing distinctions, definitions of free will can be seen in their several relations and application.

Free will may be regarded as having an idealistic or a factually empirical existence according to the standpoint from which the subject is viewed. It may be termed Liberty, Will, or Free Will, and the nature or quality of the definition depends on the philosophical proclivity of the writer.

Spinoza defines it in terms of pantheistic metaphysics. He says, "In the mind there is no absolute free will, but the mind is determined to this or that volition by a cause, which is also determined by another cause, and this again by another, and so on *ad infinitum*" (Ethics, Proposition XLVIII).

In this view of human inability to initiate movement the sphere of free moral action has but an ambiguous existence left it by monistic materialism. Or if we recognize the principle in Spinoza of living automatism, that all nature according to degree is alive, pantheism is limited by life precedent *ad infinitum*, and necessity rules without end or limitation. Man is irresistibly disposed by his organization, education and environment, and volition is something aroused within by a necessity fastened upon him by the law of his being. This necessity may take the form of fatalism, religious predestinationism, or of agnosticism.

Hegel defines human freedom as a mere thought-factor, a subjective attainment or condition. He says, "Liberty is the understanding of necessity." The acquiescence of reason to the order of the universe should be sufficient to eliminate the dread felt toward the impenetrable nature of things, and beget a calm serenity of soul which is equivalent to freedom. This is freedom from a slavish attitude toward necessity, but not real freedom from the necessary order of nature.

Leibnitz says, "Liberty is conscious spontaneity." Whether the spontaneity be illusion or real matters not. The spontan-

eous action of mind and conduct need not go back of its immediate motive to question anterior causes. The feeling of spontaneity satisfies the mind.

Janet says, "To be free is to act with a full knowledge of the reason, intentionally;" or again, "The power of acting in accordance with conceptions or ideas." In this definition we have the psychological freedom set forth in detail by Kant in his system of philosophy. Psychological freedom is not the will to will; it is not to possess the power of real initiative in empirical experience, not to be a first cause; but simply to act in conformity with reason. The determining motives of the will have natural antecedents, and are links in the chain of natural phenomena. The occurrence of an event does not depend on the idea of the event as a desired object. In a moral action the person presents to himself some possible state or achievement as a good; the quality or kind of that good depends upon his past experience, circumstantial environment, or action. Kant defines it thus, "Everything in nature operates according to laws. But only a rational being has the power of acting in conformity with the idea of law, that is on principle; in a word, has *free will*" (*Metaphysic of Ethics*, p. 36).

The will is the *ego* determining in the light of reason, and in the just and adequate feeling towards truth. The will to will belongs to the noumenal state. That principle is a prerogative of noumena; but conformity to that principle is the privilege of reason, and is regulative of purposeful action.

Paulson gives a similar definition: "This faculty of regulating and determining the particular functions of life by an idea of one's life, is precisely what we mean by free will" (*System of Ethics*, p. 468).

The same aspect is expressed by Wundt who lays particular stress on the unconscious anterior cause. He says, "It is not the physical stimulus which occasions the sensation, but that this latter arises from some elementary psychical process lying below the limen of consciousness" (*Lectures on Animal and Human Psychology*, p. 450).

The materialistic monism of mind and matter in the action

of will is thus defined by Hoeffding: "We have no right to take the mind and body for two beings or substances in reciprocal relation. We are, on the contrary, impelled to conceive *the material interaction* between the elements composing the brain and nervous system *as an outer form of the inner ideal unity of consciousness*" (Outlines of Psychology, p. 58).

According to Hoeffding man is materially and spiritually a unit, and to speak of body and mind as parts of being is simply to express one's unitary consciousness in two languages. Man thus defined is not a mere conscious automaton, but the spiritual element is entirely submerged in the material unit. The logical outcome of materialistic monism is, that volition is determined by cerebration. The will is a consequence of cerebral processes, a series of phenomenal sequences, anterior effects and causes. The will is the passive instrument of the brain so that mental and physical processes are consubstantial. Will is thus not an agent, and not to be identified with the principle of causality. All of man's actions is determined by his empirical character.

We have thus passed in review from the extreme position or conception that will in man is the divine reason phenomenally displayed, to the other extreme that there is no separable spirit in man, that all his functional being, the whole of his expression as personality, is resolved into the action of material nature.

This view of mental history in the treatment of will, describing itself in terms of psychology and metaphysics, is helpful to a clear understanding of theological positions on the subject of free will.

The proclivity of religious science is revealed in its selection of the philosophy which it employs in its method of theological development. One theologian says will is an agent a real first cause in empirical nature; that man is free not only to do what he wills, but to will what he wills. Another says that will is not an agent-cause of determination, but a transitive cause in his empirical experience; that there is no such thing as a characterless will, but as Novalis says, "Character is com-

pletely fashioned will." Everything existing phenomenally is conditioned, and does not possess the power of being the initiator or mover of absolutely primal action. The swing of opinion is between Pelagianism and Predestinationism, and the theological view will depend on the philosophy which is operative consciously or unconsciously in the doctrinal development.

The theologian to be Biblical must be neither a materialist nor a pantheist. He must neither deny spirit in man, nor say that man is all spirit, and that not his own, but merely the expression of God in him. Man cannot be a first cause absolutely else he would be equal potentially to God. But if he have no power of initiative, he lacks the function of free will.

The clearest solution is to distinguish between psychological and metaphysical freedom. Psychological freedom all men possess, but metaphysical freedom, the power to be a first cause in things moral, is not man's natural possession. Free will metaphysically man does not have in his empirical experience; free will psychologically he constantly exercises. Unaided psychological freedom of will never puts man into the condition of moral righteousness. The First Cause, God, must operate on the natural will to cause it to choose and to will righteousness to the end of moral redemption. To say that man has an uncaused choice in spiritual regeneration, that he is a causal agent in willing his religious regeneration, is to confound metaphysical freedom with psychological freedom, which latter is the property of man in his experience in the empirical world. Antecedent causes of sin have characterized man and made him what he is. He is a link in the chain of moral misdemeanor since the day of Adam, and there is no force naturally resident in him to beget a new order of life, nor to will it.

He cannot act from unmotivated choice; he does not make the supreme spiritual choice undetermined by any motive. The anterior motive must come from God. God's agent, the Holy Spirit, by the illumination of the mind with truth, prepares and aids the mind to choose. After illumination the human powers of personality relating to reason and will are no



longer merely natural, but are augmented by a divine factor. Holiness is not primarily a free choice, but the choice of an already characterized will prepared by grace. The will to will is the gift of God, the work of the Holy Spirit, and marks the beginning of coöperative energy between God and man. The consequent yielding of the sinner to the truth by the exercise of his now characterized will does not constitute him his own savior; nor does his yielding produce faith and repentance as human works; these too are the gift of God.

We are now brought to the consideration of the antecedents to regeneration in their theological relations. To know the functions of personality exercised in the work of human redemption we must have a clear understanding of man's true nature as he is fundamentally constituted. Before we can logically systematize the processes of free will functions in the conduct of salvation, we must scrutinize the psychical conduct of man's essential thought-action. We must now turn to the consideration of man's essential personality, his unitary state as a conscious being, and the relations of his natural powers as expressed in the sensibility, the intellect, and the will. Psychology is the science of sane minds, and we should look to the psychology of the human mind in the process of the order of salvation.

### III. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF VOLITION.

The theological atmosphere is sometimes clouded by an inadequate knowledge of man as he is essentially organized as a self conscious thinking being. To comprehend well the action of God upon human life for moral ends the mental and moral constitution of man must be understood. Correct psychological definitions are essential to clear thinking. Psychology has to do with what is; ethics has to do with what ought to be. The ideal should strive to realization, but it must be along the lines of the possible, and that possible is conditioned by man's capabilities as a creature in the divine image, and his susceptibilities must be understood to appreciate and define what God can and does do for him in his restoration to ethical char-



acter. Theology and ethics are inseparably connected, and no aspect of the divine relation to man that violates the distinctive consciousness of what is just, holy, and morally elevating as conduct between ethical personalities, between God and his moral creatures, can satisfy the mind that seeks to justify the ways of God to man.

Balch says, "No treatment of the subject of moral judgment and right conduct can be accurate without an examination of the psychological basis of thought and volition." And again, "The full importance of Christian ethical psychology, as part of a scientific scrutiny of religious phenomena, is too important to be longer ignored" (*Introduction to the Study of Christian Ethics*, pp. 29, 30).

The moral consciousness must scrutinize the conduct of man in his treatment of divine relations and operations lest a false and inadequate conception of God falsify the divine character and attributes.

In order to magnify the grace of God and to attribute salvation to the proper source, not infrequently man is demeaned below the state of his true intellectual and moral properties and powers.

When does man become a coöperative agent in his own work of grace? To what extent is he a passive subject of divine action, and what marks the limit of human inability and passivity, and the beginning of conscious and responsible co-activity with the Spirit of God? Can man be regenerated solely by divine illumination without the action of human feeling and will? Can the human subject be acted on illuminatively and his will be left undisturbed and inactive? Does the first approach of God to man for his spiritual redemption and restoration initiate regeneration apart from the operation of any functional action of the intellectual part of man? Can a man become informed, and obtain knowledge without the exercise of the sensibility and the will?

A correct psychology alone can bring into right and logical continuity the human and divine factors and actions in the work of redemption.

Man is a unitary personality. There is no departmental condition of human life. A transverse section of conscious personality would show no strata of parallel and distinct functional action of existence.

We misconstrue man's mental and moral personality by hypostatizing a faculty of will as distinctly functional from intellect. We cannot separate man into functional departments, and pick and choose bits of personal reality as genuine and essentially formative of religious and moral life. The intellect, sensibility, and will, constitute one undivided personality. There can be no feeling apart from consciousness; and the person conscious of feeling or of sensibility is the person intellectually active. The intellect in conscious action is the mind alive to sensibility. Feeling that results in mental action is always conscious feeling. The stone under the blow of the hammer has a tremor, a vibration of its parts, but has no focus or center of consciousness, hence no feeling. Feeling is always and only conscious feeling. We sometimes have sensations that do not result in perceptions. Not sufficient attention has been given to gather the fleeting sensations into the focus of self-consciousness so that they become matter for knowledge through self-distinction and self-realization in capacity for contemplation. The self-determining person must distinguish himself from his sensations, and identify himself for distinct perception. He determines his feeling and is determined by it, and becomes a principle of action. He makes the object his own, and seeks to realize it, to translate the mental object into a rational result.

The will is reason energizing. The will is not created by knowledge, but is regulated by it. "No deed of will, however free it may be conceived of as being, is an isolated or unrelated psychosis" (Ladd, *Psychology Descriptive and Explanatory*, p. 635).

"In a word, volition is psychic or moral fact pure and simple, and is absolutely completed when the stable state of the idea is there" (James, *Psychology*, vol. ii, p. 560).

Man's consciousness, religious or otherwise, in its determina-

tions acts as a unitary principle. It is only in reflective analytic thought that intellect, sensibility, and will, are discriminated.

The following quotations show the universality of the acceptance of this recognized principle, that consciousness, while viewed under three aspects, exists as one undivided functional action.

T. H. Green says, "There is one subject, or spirit, which desires in all man's experience of desire, understands in all operations of his intelligence, wills in all his acts of willing" (*Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 122).

Harris says, "Knowledge is presupposed in determination; a determination is possible only in the light of intelligence. But the knowledge can influence the will only through the feelings which it occasions" (*Philosophical Basis of Theism*, p. 389).

Royce writes, "Popular psychology long since far too sharply sundered the Intellect and the Will in the empirical process of the finite human mind. \* \* \* A more modern psychology has been led to its well known doctrine that all such psychological divisions are rather distinctions between different aspects of the same process, than means for telling us of naturally sundered or even of separable processes" (*The World and the Individual*, vol. i, p. 434).

Ladd writes, "For it cannot be said too often: in every developed deed of will the whole man acts; and there is no such thing as a willing to do which is not a complex resultant of all three fundamental forms of so called faculty" (*Psychology Descriptive and Explanatory*, p. 617).

Lotze also writes, "What we know as three is nevertheless but one in the being of the soul. The soul does not enter even into its own manifestations in so fragmentary a fashion that one of its parts can be awake while the others are dormant; on the contrary, in every mode of its action the whole soul energizes" (*Microcosmos*, vol. i, p. 180).

In view of this universally recognized principle in the action of man's soul let us consider what must be the content,

and what the effect of prevenient grace, as well as what must be the place of free will in the *ordo salutis*.

#### IV. THE PLACE OF FREE WILL IN THE ORDER OF SALVATION.

In the economy of divine grace God has willed to act in a revelatory way both in his natural works and in the conscience of man additional to his chief and paramount revelation in his word. The heathen world has had the blessing of unsought preparatory grace, which has schooled races of men in matters of natural truth and conscience.

Special precursory grace has come through divine illumination to Christendom revealing the truths of the gospel. Illumination, as an act of divine energy revealing the gospel message and proffering the benefits of its power, prepares the human mind to understand the import of the call and the proffer of redemption. There can be no religious acceptance without a knowledge of the thing accepted. The result of illumination is no mere passive state. God's action on man stimulates to human action. The flower bursts from the bud which God prepares. Prevenient grace in its energy of illumination illumines the man, and not merely makes an impress on the mind leaving it in a passive incompetent attitude toward the truth.

The departmental division of man's soul is merely a concept for analytic procedure in the study of logical method, and not a *de facto* play of successively operating functions in man's action. The gospel is not a mere exertion of divine power on man, but an offer to the will, for free decision. There is no individual salvation without faith, and there is no faith without the element of religious knowledge, and in the impartation of that knowledge the will and the feelings act in conjunction with the intellect in the apprehension of the truth. Truth in the soul implies activity of the soul. God presents the truth, and man's attitude toward the truth is the expression of his will. Grace is the attitude of God to man; the Holy Spirit is the agent who expresses that attitude and becomes its energizing power. Faith is man's attitude to God; and the will is the agent which expresses that attitude and energizes the soul's action.

Dorner says of faith, "It aptly describes that attitude of the

heart to God, through which by divine condescension religion becomes a reality; for in *pistis* according to its Biblical meaning, living receptiveness and spontaneous action are indissolubly united" (System of Christian Doctrine, vol. ii, 121).

The older dogmaticians gave the following order in the plan of redemption: Vocation, Illumination, Regeneration, Conversion, under which last head were included Penitence, Contrition and Faith, then followed Justification, Mystical Union, and Renovation, or Sanctification. In this order regeneration unbibli- cally precedes faith, which Dorner pronounces "monstrous."

The exigencies not of exegesis, but of doctrinal dilemma directed this order. Illumination was associated with an efficacious call, and regeneration was ascribed as the effect of the first touch of the Holy Spirit in his impartation of spiritual knowledge. The Anabaptist controversy made important the attitude of the baptized infant to the action of divine grace, and to strengthen and maintain the position of infant salvation in the Lutheran system, it was deemed essential that regeneration take place at the incipency of the Spirit's action on the human subject. In this view regeneration was regarded not as instantaneous, but progressive, successive, and gradual in the possession of its power and efficacy. Regeneration was taught to be instantaneous in the infant soul, since there was no act of stubborn resistance; in the adult life, owing to difficulties of resistance, regeneration was held to be progressive. Faith was thus regarded as a product of regeneration, and the matter of infant faith need not be sorely pressed.

Hollazius says, "Regeneration is the act of grace by which the Holy Spirit endows the sinner with saving faith, that, his sins being pardoned, he may become a son of God and an heir of eternal life" (876). And again he says, "Faith is the effect of regenerating grace" (856).

In this doctrinal *schema* regeneration can occur not only without will, but as well without faith being yet born, which is in contradiction of the true exegesis of the divine word. Man cannot be morally passive in a change which is moral and definitive of character. The morality of the spiritual change im-

plies the willing relation of man. On the divine side the power is all of God; on the human side the attitude is that of the willing man, the content of which is faith. The assenting will is not the natural will, but the will characterized by the action of divine grace exercised in the precursory work of illumination.

Regeneration is not a physical change, but a change of moral state. It is not a conscious act in man's experience; it comes without the consciousness of whence or whither on man's part. It is a work wrought entirely of God upon a divinely characterized human person, whose attitude of assenting will is also of God. A moral character is attended by conviction and decision to have a content of moral worth, and conviction cannot be produced in any one who will not permit it.

Jesus says that a man must will to hear in order to understand (John 8.43). Regeneration is solely of God, but the recipient state of man has in it a content of characterized will. Conversion is the human side, and is a conscious act embracing both moral attitude, and moral movement. Regeneration creates new dispositions; conversion arouses new acts.

Man cannot produce till he has previously received. Grace and truth come by the word of revelation, and when the state of the intellect is already disciplined, man is regulative of what he receives. His will acts in the acts of the intellect; truth is presented and the self-conscious person takes its attitude. The moral will is not a spontaneity of nature, but an effluence of an enlightened character, of a preventiently disciplined reason. Without choice there is no moral character. As Martensen says, "Character consists, so far as it is good, in right choice."

The choice is not prompted by naturally innate psychological tendencies to moral goodness. The prepossessing inclinations toward the morally good come from the mind preventiently disciplined by the Holy Spirit. God brings man to the point of conscious personal relation to spiritual truth where man must decide, and where he is enabled to decide rightly if his will acquiesce in the divine movement.

In the old doctrinal order of grace no place was allowed to any act of man lest the majesty of God might be impugned, or

the excellency of grace minimized. Even conversion was deemed by some to be purely a divine act. Hutterus says, "The beginning, the progress, and, in short, the whole development of his conversion, is to be ascribed altogether and alone to the operation of the Holy Spirit" (Loc. Com., p. 281).

However felicitous this *schema* may be for the doctrinal end in view, it is nevertheless unscriptural. We must recognize the rational spontaneity of characted will in things moral. Chemnitz recognizes the proper psychological order of man's acting personality when he writes, "It is not, therefore, to be understood that I am to wait, with a secure and indolent will, until renovation or conversion has been accomplished, according to the stages already described, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, or without any movement on my part" (Loc. Th., I, 199).

Martensen also says, "Conversion is at once a turning from and a return, is a thoroughly changed direction of the will through its submission to grace, whereby a man breaks with his past, leaves the way he has hitherto gone, and enters on a *new way to righteousness*" (Christian Ethics, Individual, p. 138).

Two vital points demand scriptural and theological consideration in defining the property of free will in the process of redemption: *the relation of free will to the content of faith; and the relation of faith to regeneration.* The scriptural basis of the action of faith in relation to regeneration must be decisive; and the content of faith must receive its proper psychological and theological recognition.

Repentance and faith go together. Repentance is a change of mind; it is the will taking its attitude in relation to revealed truth. Faith, its attendant, has for its content, *Notitia, Assensus, and Fiducia.* When *knowledge* exists for the mind it is the intellect alive, and when alive it is no "isolated or unrelated psychosis," intellect, sensibility, and will, combine in the perception and understanding of truth. The will is necessarily included, for will is the reason energizing. "In the later technical language of Christian ethical philosophy, faith is an intellectual virtue; it is the perception or ideal of the intellect,



which is rendered possible by the existence of a certain state of the will" (Strong, *Christian Ethics*, p. 97).

Dorner says, "But it is indisputable that there be an actual crisis, a free, conscious decision for or against Christianity, for without this no definite settlement of the worth and destiny of the individual were possible" (*System of Doctrine*, iv, 181).

Luthardt clearly states the matter doctrinally and exegetically, "The essential nature of faith is formally a thing of inwardness and freedom; it does not consist of a doing, but of an inner personal relationship." "It is designated as contemplative and appropriating cognition (*theorein*, Jno. 3 : 15, 6 : 40; *ginoskein*, Jno. 6 : 69, 10 : 38, 16 : 6-8), as entering into and agreeing with the will (*lambanein*, Jno. 3 : 11 f.), as inmost appropriation" (*History of Christian Ethics*, pp. 81, 82).

*Assent* is the asserted attitude of the person, involving the rational and volitional factors of his self consciousness in relation to an object of truth or knowledge.

*Fiducia* is trustful acceptance, the feeling self energizing to mental submission, a position of voluntary repose in the favor of God, a self-commitment in confidence. In this act man asserts his moral feeling, and conforms his will to his composed intellect.

In both repentance and faith the will is an essential factor. Martensen says, "In true repentance the honest *will* to be redeemed asserts itself and the man submits to be redeemed, to be justified before God, and that of pure grace." And still further, "Repentance must not become a state beyond which one makes no advance, not a fruitless brooding over ourselves and our past, so that we come to no *volition* for the future" (*Christian Ethics, Individual*, pp. 142, 143).

In *metanoia* the soul looks back and forsakes; in *pistis* the soul looks forward and accepts. The character of faith is thus seen to be the intellect in composure voluntarily asserting its attitude to God; it is a position reached through an accepted gospel; not an energy, but an assumed attitude of the soul. It is the gift of God, for it has been wrought by the Holy Spirit, who is the expressive energy of God's feeling and attitude of favor.



There can be no saving faith before acts of free will. What takes place psychologically between illumination and regeneration is the history of the soul in its self conscious relation and chosen attitude to the inworking divine principle that begins and leads the way to salvation. The assent of the will is more than non resistance. To resist is to refuse, and to refuse is to choose, which is voluntary determination. To act voluntarily is to act electively. The reposeful state of confidence is accompanied by a satisfied intellect, but not an intellect that has fathomed the mystery of the Spirit's action, or penetrated the profound depths of the soul's constitution, but is content to rest in the facts of the gospel. The whole is the work of grace, but that grace is the action of God's Spirit upon a self-conscious, rational being subsisting in the divine likeness.

Free will is not a principle of the mind which is independent of all influences extrinsic to itself, or of effects prior to the will's own action. The will is not *in equilibrio* of natural capability to reject or accept, but is precursoryly disciplined by the knowledge of right, truth, and duty. God answers to every cry of the soul, and moral inability is a want of inclination. That want of inclination is not due to the lack of illumination and presented truth. These prevenient factors God supplies and it is man's will, the susceptibility and capability of which are divinely characterized, that determines whether the divine work shall be effectual for the percipient subject of grace. The resultant effect of illumination gives opportunity and capacity to man's will, which composite factor precedes regeneration.

After *energeia* follows *sunergeia*, and the composite character of the factors in the procedure is distinctly defined in the Biblical data.

Jesus says, "No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him," (Jno. 6 : 44); on the other hand Jesus also says, "Ye *will* not to come to me (*ou thelete elthein*), that ye may have life," (Jno. 5 : 40). Repentance and faith go hand in hand : "Repent ye, and believe in the gospel," (Mk. 1 : 15). Repentance is a gift, "A Savior, for to give re-

pentance to Israel, and remission of sins," (Acts 5 : 31 ; see also Acts 11 : 18, 2 Tim. 2 : 25, Heb. 6 : 6) ; it is also a command for a determinate act of man, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," (Matt. 3 : 2 ; see also Matt. 4 : 17, 11 : 20, Mk. 1 : 15, 6 : 12, Lk. 13 : 3, 15 : 7, Acts 17 : 30, 2 : 38, 3 : 19, 8 : 22, 26 : 20, Rev. 2 : 5, 16, 21, 22).

That repentance is a human act is thus declared, "More joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth," (Lk. 15 : 7). Conversion also is defined as a human exercise, "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out," (Acts 3 : 19).

The relation between knowledge and belief is that of precursory illumination to the exercise of faith ; "He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life," (Jno. 5 : 24), "The Word of God ; which also worketh in you that believe," (2 Thes. 2 : 13) ; and the responsibility of man for his determination of moral attitude is thus clearly expressed, "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life," (Jno. 5 : 40). The combined actions of the divinely and preventively disciplined human mind and the gift bestowing energizing Holy Spirit are most explicitly set forth in the Biblically revealed procedure of the plan of grace. God gives repentance, yet "He commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent," (Acts 17 : 30) ; he gives faith, yet commands all men to believe, "By grace have ye been saved through faith ; and that (*touto*) not of yourselves : it is the gift of God," (Eph. 2 : 8) ; the whole procedure is the gift of God, and faith which is part of that whole, must also be a gift ; and yet, as repeatedly proclaimed, the clearly defined duty of man is to believe.

The will to will is likewise the work of God, "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work," (Phil. 2 : 13), while man is definitely rebuked for not exercising his will, "Ye *will* not to come to me, that ye may have life," (Jno. 5 : 40 ; also Matt. 23 : 37, Lk. 13 : 34, *ouk ethelesate*).

The essentialness of the faith of the percipient subject for the reception of salvation is an implication in all the efficacious work of God as scripturally revealed. Believing is absolutely

essential to the recipiency of redemption (Lk. 8 : 12, Jno. 3 : 15, 16, 5 : 24, 8 : 24, Acts 10 : 43, 13 : 39, 16 : 31, Rom. 1 : 16, 1 Cor. 1 : 21).

Repentance and faith must precede justification (Acts 13 : 19, Rom. 3 : 22, 26, 28, 30, 4 : 5, 16, Gal. 2 : 16, 3 : 8, 24). Justification logically precedes regeneration as it is a corrected status of the ungodly, "But believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly" (Rom. 4 : 5); though in the conduct of grace, Justification, Regeneration, and Conversion, are best related as simultaneous. Justification is solely an act of God *for* the believing subject; regeneration is solely an act of God *upon* the believing subject. Regeneration is a begetting (1 Pet. 1 : 23, 1 Jno. 4 : 7); a birth (Jno. 3 : 3, Jas. 1 : 8); a creation (2 Cor. 5 : 17); a resurrection (Eph. 2 : 1). Man has personality before regeneration, but a personality prepared and characterized by God's Spirit.

From the scriptural criteria the order of procedure in redemption is, first, the divine precursory work of human preparation, in which man is brought to a condition of knowledge and opportunity whereby capacity is wrought in him for personal and intelligent moral choice and action; and secondly, the determinative attitude of man brought about by his will, which will, as a conveniently disciplined factor for his salvation, asserts what his personal relation to God's favor shall be.

The will is already disciplined to accentuate the gospel truth in the proffer of grace, and the act of the will does not simply indicate the soul's attitude, but produces it. Apart from spiritual knowledge man cannot know what Christianity is, and the attainment of knowledge implies the simultaneous and combined action of man's intellect, sensibility, and will. Faith becomes effectually religious when it is an offering up of the will, and not of the mind only, and the effectual grace becomes irresistible when it carries with it the affections and the will. A purely passive subject that sustains no personal attitude is but spiritually infectable. The precursory divine energy of illumination and preparation is not infectious, but is an act of presentation to the mind and the will for their discipline in per-

ceiving the truth of the gospel, and for the working of intelligent capacity to exercise choice in the option presented.

Man is not divided aggregate in the properties of his conscious personality, and when God affects his knowledge, he as well affects his will. God proffers the will to will, and man's psychological function in the acceptance or rejection of the proffer, is the exercise of free will.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE ORIGIN, NATURE AND CONQUEST OF DEATH.

BY PROFESSOR L. A. FOX, D.D.

What is death? This question is almost constantly pressing itself upon us. As we stand by the casket of a dear friend or look forward to our own inevitable future we ask again and again, what is it to die? A complete answer would carry us too far afield for our present limits. It would take us into the most mysterious investigations of science and into the profoundest problems of philosophy. But starting with the facts that lie nearest at hand we may come into a light that will satisfy one of the deepest wants of the heart.

Death as it appears to the senses is the cessation of life. It is the end of vital processes. That peculiar force that we call vital energy seems to be extinguished. Death breaks down the organism and sends back the elements into inorganic matter. We may watch its progress and tell when its work is done. When all respiration has ceased and the pulse is stopped and the heart is still we call it death. The eye is glazed, the ear is deaf, the nerves give no response to impulse, the internal machinery is hushed and all the physical relations are changed. The antagonistic forces, no longer resisted, go on rapidly in their work of dissolution. At last only a handful of dust is all that remains. The final result of death on the material side has been reached. This is what appears to the

physical senses, and, beside what it has to say about oxygen and carbon and the other elements that make up the body, science knows nothing beyond it.

But this answer does not seem sufficient to the immense majority of men. Death cuts off our plans. Our capacities are not fully developed, nor is perfection reached before all progress is arrested. The purpose of our being, as revealed in our constitution, is never met. The ends of our nature are thwarted. All men feel that death is unnatural and shrink from it as a tyrant forcing himself with irresistible power upon them. They believe that it was not the Creator's first design that they should die. They look with firm hope to another life. They call death, therefore, a separation of the soul from the body. They look upon it as a dark gateway between this world and the invisible sphere of spirits. Ecclesiastes gives utterance to this universal feeling: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was and the spirit unto God who gave it." Save a few sceptics, men do not believe that "death ends all." This answer coming out of what seems to be universal intuitions is no less worthy of respect than that of the common sense.

Death is now coextensive with physical life. The law of death is coeval with organic beings on the earth. For millions of years, before man appeared, it had absolutely universal sway. Innumerable individuals, many species and entire families had become extinct and left upon the stony pages of the geological records the unmistakable evidence of its ravages through unnumbered ages before man was created. It is, therefore, a matter of surprise to find so recent and able a theologian as Bishop Dahle maintaining that "death in historic times depends upon man's Fall." While admitting the fact of the fossil remains of animals "that seem to antedate man's appearance," he asserts that it is "the view of Scripture that the present dominion of death owes its origin to sin." His argument is more spacious than solid. Sin affected only man's relation to the universe, not that of animals among themselves and to the world. It made man mortal, not the flower and the bird. It

did not give talons to the eagles nor fangs to the lion. The world into which death was introduced by the transgression was that of man. No fair interpretation of the Scriptures can find in them any other doctrine.

Man on his physical side is an animal. His anatomy and physiology are wonderfully like the beasts around him. His brain may be studied from that of a dog. He is born and grows as his congeners of the forest. "Death and birth are twins." Whether immediately created or evolved, he is subject to the physical laws which hold throughout the kingdom of the fauna. As far back as we can trace him through history and archaeological relics he has been mortal. The oldest prehistoric man is known only from his skull. Science knows nothing of our origin, but so far as it can discover, man was from the beginning under the universal law of death. Some scientific men, like Prof. Haeckel, of Germany, and Dr. Paul Carus, of America, have ventured to assert that death is a necessity and that a future life of the individual is an absolute impossibility. The individual life of every one of us arises from the amalgamation of two cells and that ultimate extinction is the inevitable result.

But man is more than animal. He is immeasurably superior to the greatest of the brutes. No matter how close the resemblance on the physical side, there is an immense difference on the side of the mental. If the anthropoid ape has learned to use a stone as a hammer with which to crack the nut, man has produced the miracle of modern civilization. Though he had the advantages of several thousand years in advance of us and the benefit of an experience for a good many centuries, he remains a brute. Philosophy, whose business it is to interpret all the facts of knowledge, finds in man a factor which is called personality. This factor is able to control in its own interests the lower elements of our nature and form character. It has peculiar prerogatives and a special dignity. It demands immortality for itself. In this consciousness of personality man stands alone in the animal world. But as a matter of fact, in spite of all these high claims, the body dies. Our nature

seems to wrap up in itself an antinomy and to involve thought in hopeless contradiction. But philosophy is not wholly without an explanation of the facts. There are manifest evidences of disorder and traces of a fall from a better state. Andrew D. White, representing no inconsiderable school, may repudiate with a suppressed sneer, the doctrine of the Church and see only the rise of man, but the two ideas are not in essential opposition. There may be a rise out of a wreck. There may be an advance in intelligence without corresponding progress in moral character. There are falls in the case of individuals, and there may have been a fall of the race. If Mr. White is right, there is even in this doctrine of Christian theology, which retarded science so many, many years, the evidence that something is badly the matter with humanity, and it can be best explained by some such fact as that recorded in Genesis. Philosophy, therefore, finds some reasons for believing that death came to us as a penalty.

If we take the pains to read over again the account in Genesis we shall find that exemption from the law of death was a special grace. Adam ate of the fruits of Eden. There was then, waste and repair of tissue. Cells were worn out and died, and new ones were formed, just as it is in our bodies today. There was assimilation and excretion. Once at least he slept, and there is nothing to indicate that this sleep was anything remarkable. There must have been some weariness in the cerebral centres and some need of periodic recuperation. A being whose cells die and who needs rest in sleep may live a great many years but cannot be immortal. But there was a tree of life in the midst of the garden. It seems to have been the sacrament of life. It not only symbolized but conveyed the grace of continued life. It seems to have had the power of conferring immortality even on a sinner, for God set a special guard around it lest man eat of it and live forever in his sins and miseries. According to that story Adam fell under the law of death when he forfeited the grace of immortality. Human death originated in sin. It is the penalty for willful unbelief and transgression.



Doubts have been cast upon these early chapters in Genesis because of their likeness to the Babylonian stories on the clay tablets. Men were at first surprised at the similarity. Some dump all the cosmogonies into one heap and label it myth. But we ought to note some important differences. Lenormant says: "The analogy of form between the myths and the Bible narrative is striking. It is doubtless the same tradition but apprehended in quite another sense, symbolizing an invention in the material order, instead of being applied to a fundamental fact in the moral order, and additionally disfigured by the monstrous conception, too frequent among Pagans, which represent the divinity as a terrible and malignant power jealous of the progress and happiness of men." "The inspired writer drew from it its solemn teaching."\* It has been frequently noted that the one is polytheistic and the other theistic. The author of Genesis did not copy the tablets. Why should he try to adapt to his own theology a story proved false by its polytheistic representations." But even after we eliminate the differences a likeness remains that cannot be explained as mere coincidence. The accounts must have had a common source in some earlier tradition. The origin of that tradition can be only a subject of conjecture. If not a direct revelation, the order of creation as given in the first chapter of Genesis is one of the most marvelous things in literature. Its close agreement with the discoveries of geology in recent centuries, if not inspired, shows exceedingly shrewd guessing or a degree of scientific knowledge among the ancients we had never suspected. As soon as we cease to look to the Bible for exact science we shall find in it clear evidences of inspiration. It is not very remarkable that Moses should have drawn upon that early tradition among his people, or even copied earlier documents. The Synoptists used freely some earlier source approved by the common consent of the eye-witnesses. Luke wrote in the Gospel and the Acts incorporated documents very clearly distinguished in style from his own composition. In miracles God uses the material that is at hand. Why then

\* *Beginnings of History*, p. 105.



may not the inspired writer of Genesis have used sources when he was assured of their authenticity?

There are some difficulties in the narrative. From the time of Origin there have been Christian scholars who have held that the story of the Fall was not intended to be precise history but a symbolic presentation of great facts and truths. It is not difficult to find in the Bible instances of accommodation to the ignorance of the age to which the revelations were made. Genesis was primarily written for a people whose conceptions of religious ideas were not much above that of children. It would be absurd to interpret many things in it as final expressions of truth. We all know that the statement that God repented that he had made man and that he walked out in the cool of the evening into his garden, like a tropical planter, are not to be taken literally. Nor can we think that a real serpent talked with Eve. There may be more symbols in this account than are generally believed. But there is danger of carrying this kind of interpretation too far and resolving the whole Bible into a mere allegory. There is a real historic basis for the story and all the essential facts are to be taken as they are given in it.

The story commends itself to us as history, because it gives the only satisfactory explanation of the facts of our present condition. It is the only solution of the mystery of our natural depravity. It accounts for the antagonism between the claims of our personality and our weakness and death. It gives the reasons for those features of death which indicate that it is a penalty. It has the mystery of the Fall but in it there is given also the interpretation of the mysteries of life. Pascal says: "Without this mystery, the most incomprehensible of all, we are incomprehensible to ourselves. The knot of our condition takes its twists and turns in this abyss, so that man is more incomprehensible without this mystery than this mystery is incomprehensible to man." \*

Those questions which perplex scholars in regard to the authenticity of the Pentateuch have an easy solution for those

\* Thoughts, ch. 10.

who recognize the divine authority of Christ. He treated the story of creation as containing a true history. Speaking of marriage he refers to the creation of woman in Eden. Alluding to the first temptation he gives a clue to its right interpretation when he says: "Ye are of your father the devil. He was a murderer from the beginning. He is a liar and the father of it." He always refers to the Old Testament as inspired. Paul also makes that story the basis and authority for his discussion of the origin of sin and death. He regarded it as substantially true.

The Biblical account of its origin explains some of the features of death. If we admit with the scientist that it is purely natural it seems to be premature. It deviates from the general law. The length of life in the animal world is five times the period of growth. Man is twenty years in arriving at maturity. His life ought to reach a century. The higher intellectual endowment, which should have lifted him above the ordinary level, has not been able to keep him up to it. For a very long time our years have been three score and ten and only by reason of superior vigor can they reach four score. The average is not thirty-five. Some disturbing element must have been introduced at an early period in the history of the race to shorten life. We see the effects upon health and life of vicious conduct. Diseases are generated by vices and transmitted to offspring. Thousands of children are dying every year from the results of the sins of parents. That we all die prematurely points back to some great sin in the progenitors of the human family.

Death seems to us to be a degradation. "In different lands and among different races there is not only a repugnance to corpses but in many places they are regarded as things which in themselves both are unclean and cause uncleanness in all men and things that come in contact with them." Among the Jews the presence of a dead body in a house made all who lived in it unclean for seven days. Among the Romans a funeral in a family excluded all the members of the family from religious rites for thirty days. Livy tells us of

men who being candidates for office remained, for this reason, away from home that they might not be prevented from taking part in the election. We find similar feelings in regard to dead-bodies among the Greeks and Hindus. There is an innate repugnance to touching the dead. We believe that there is something sacred about the body of a Christian, but it is because of what it has been and will be, not of what it is now. We handle it tenderly, uncover the head, tread softly and speak in undertones out of respect to the feelings of the bereaved and the memories of the life, but not for any reverence for anything that belongs to the body itself when the soul is gone. We bury it with solemn ceremonies because of the hope of a resurrection. Death brings the king and the peasant, the rich and the poor, the scholars and the simpleton, into one common rank. "How dieth the wise man? As the fool." Men and brutes are brought down to a common plane. "For that which befalleth the sons of man befalleth the beast; as the one dieth so dieth the other, yea they all have one breath, so that man hath no preëminence above the beast." If death were purely natural we might look upon it as a great evil but not as degradation. There is in this instinctive feeling an innate testimony to the fact that it is a penalty.

Death seems to be attended with unnecessary suffering. Sometimes the brute dies in great pain but when they are left to follow their own instincts and obey their own laws death is generally without great suffering. Beasts and birds of prey attack where death is quickest. It is said that dying in the power of an animal foe is painless. The experience of Livingstone with the lion in the African jungle makes the statement probable. But man suffers more than the brute. Our shortened life goes out with a stern protest from nature. The pain of dying is greater than is necessary to accomplish the simple end of our removal from the world. The old man having reached his four score years sometimes passes away as quietly as if falling into a gentle sleep. So it is possible all might have died if death had not been imposed upon us as a penalty for sin.

Death is dreaded as a curse. The brute instinctively shrinks from that which causes death, but does not dread death itself. The instinctive fear is nature's means of preserving life. The animal does not understand the meaning of its trembling and flight. But we know what we dread, and that knowledge awakens in us a feeling of horror. It is not simply the pain of dying that makes us afraid, for we will submit to even greater pain to escape it, but death itself. We may fully believe that it is a relief from the ills of life and that it is the way to unspeakable happiness yet we draw back from it as from a great evil. The most saintly Christian, with strong faith and bright hopes of heaven, feels in common with other men a sense of shuddering as he looks forward to his grave. In sympathy with this universal feeling we sometimes say of the best man, even after the struggle is over, "Poor man." The irrepressible sorrows of the bereaved are the instinctive cries of our nature against death as a curse. There are some things worse than death, but the world has crowned it as the King of Terrors. "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." It is a penalty and this is the reason why we regard it as such a great evil.

Without sin in the world there would have been no death. But what, then, would have been the destiny of the body? The Scriptures have left this question in the sphere of speculative theology. It is not probable that the marks of weakness in Adam, such as the need of food and rest, would have been immortal. Some have supposed that the body was only provisional; that it was intended to be a means of discipline until the higher faculties were developed and trained, and then to be laid aside; that the body when no longer needed, as an organ of the spiritual nature would have fallen off like the leaves of Autumn and returned to dust. This view grew out of certain philosophic ideas of matter. Plato held that matter is diametrically opposed to spirit, and the Manicheans and Gnostics, following him, taught that it is essentially evil. This opinion crept into the Church and gave rise to asceticism that tried to reduce the body to the lowest point of existence. There are

still lingering among us such very low conceptions of the nature and possibilities of matter that some deny the resurrection of the body. Perhaps if we understood better the essential nature of matter, a body would not seem to us to be so much out of place in a world of spirits.

Other theologians believe that man would always have remained incarnate but the spiritual nature as soon as it was developed in holiness and power would have elevated the body more and more until at last transformed and spiritualized it would have been transferred to heaven. The body would thus have become what it is destined to be after the resurrection. This view is in harmony with the idea that sin did not altogether thwart God's purpose in regard to man but merely changed for a time its method of execution. It is in harmony, also, with the account in Genesis of the purpose of the tree of life.

There is still another opinion, that men would have become established in holiness and been raised above the possibility of death but would have remained forever on the earth. It is based on the facts that man was placed in close relation to the material world and given dominion over it, and that his body was foreshadowed by a long series of types and came as the end of a development that went on through unnumbered ages. It is not supposed that a process so long in maturing could issue in a merely temporary arrangement.

But none of the arguments are conclusive. We may hold either without danger to our religious life. What we might have been does not concern us now that we are the heirs of sin and death, and we will turn to the more practical questions of the nature of death.

Our theory of life determines our view of death. Every one who thinks at all about the meaning of life and of the world has some sort of philosophy. It may be very crude or wholly false but it controls his character. People who decry philosophy are like the man who talked prose all his life but never knew it. We must philosophize whether we will or not. The philosophy of the masses is generally at second hand and rudely fashioned in very small moulds, but it can be traced

back to some one of the great schools. We may, therefore, go at once to the chief sources.

Atheistic materialism denies the existence of God and soul and any kind of substance except matter and of every sort of power except physical force. Thought is a function of the brain and life a product of the organism. We are brought into existence by blind forces, and we continue to live until they are exhausted. Nature cares not for individuals, but only for species. Birth, life and death, are all alike, the result of inexorable law. One who cares for his life must preserve it as long as he can by balancing forces, but when at length he is overcome he must accept cheerfully his defeat and yield gracefully to the inevitable. Death, our debt to nature, is the annihilation of personality and individuality. We drop back into eternal night, sink again into absolute nothingness.

This is surely a low view of life and a fearfully gloomy conception of death. It assumes what has never been, and never can be proved, that matter is the only entity. It ignores the great psychological problem which divides philosophers into Empiricists and Idealists. It overlooks the importance of the spiritual and sets aside all the instinctive longings of the heart and the intuitive convictions of men in regard to immortality. Its assumptions are so unwarranted and its difficulties are so great that it is rapidly losing the hold it had in philosophical circles a quarter of a century ago. The reaction, easily observed everywhere, is based upon the truth that the world in its inmost nature is spiritual. This is almost the very words of an acknowledgement wrung from one whose sympathies are so strongly materialistic that he says that "every reality is material." \*

Materialistic Pantheism does not differ very much from pure materialism except in names. God and religion and immortality are treated with an air of reverence, but when we come to understand them we find that they have entirely new meanings. "God is the soul of the universe," "the law that shaped and is still shaping the world, that is forming and ever reform-

\* Carus, *Soul of Man*.

ing, evolving and ever re-evolving the universe." The soul of man is his physical life and his mind is the coordinated feelings. Feeling is only one side of nerve movement, and the coordinating power is in the central organs of the brain, perhaps in the *corpus striatum*. Immortality is reabsorption into the All and the permanence of influence. Personality is the result of organized feelings and perishes with the organism. Death is the absolute destruction of the personal ego.

Idealistic Pantheism, now generally known as Idealistic Monism, is a higher form of philosophy than Materialism. With Materialistic Pantheism it holds to the eternity of matter and mind in the Ultimate Substance, but while Materialism emphasizes the material, Idealism lays the emphasis upon the spiritual side. Instead of evolving out of matter the universe has evolved out of mind. The world has a meaning because it was formed for a purpose. The universal Reason is impersonal but attains a form of personality in men. Our rationality is only the Reason operating through us. The soul of man is absorbed at death by the universal soul. Some sort of individuality and personality may be preserved through eternity but it will not be numerical, because numbers cannot apply to spirits. "All spirits are one. It is absurd to speak of a plurality of spirits coexistent or successive. The soul is neither one, nor all; neither some one entity, nor nothing." \*— In an eternal self-movement the Absolute Spirit proceeded out from himself and produced nature, and in returning to himself becomes self conscious spirits. But while some philosophers have carried theory out to what seems at first to be its logical conclusion and denied a future personal life, this is not necessarily involved. Dr. Paulus of Berlin, the greatest representation of this philosophy, says: "The fact that we retain the past in memory gives us the idea of a permanent relation existing between the individual soul and the universal spirit. Immortality in the sense of eternity is doubtless a necessary conception. It is not conceivable that a psychical life should absolutely perish. An event can not become unreal by becoming

\* Journal of Speculative Philosophy.



a thing of the past. If it were so, if the past were absolutely and in every sense unreal, as unreal as that which never was, there would evidently be no reality at all, for it cannot exist in the present which is an unextended point of time. Now what is my psychical life which belongs to the past? We say that it exists in memory and, as it were, continues to participate in the further development, and thus it remains related to the present. If a similar relation, obtained between the individual life and the universal mind, it would seem that the individual life has permanent existence and activity, even after death. It would continue as a permanent element in the divine life and consciousness. And nothing would hinder us from thinking that it also retains its relative independence and the unity of its consciousness within the whole."\* He refers to Fechner, who is the real founder of modern physiological psychology, as following the same line of thought and reaching the same conclusion. According to this interpretation a future personal existence is not only possible but also probable. Death breaks up the relation of the soul to the body and permits its return to a closer union with God, the universal soul.

There is another philosophy, called sometimes Dualism and sometimes Philosophy of Common Sense, which holds that matter and mind are different substances. Matter is extended substance, mind is conscious substance. Matter is not an eternal but created substance. The philosophy is therefore improperly called Dualism in the philosophic sense of the word. Body and mind are in this life united by organic relation in a personal union. They act reciprocally but maintain their separate substantiality. Death is the dissolution of this relation. The body having lost its organic life returns to the natural elements. The soul, the real self, goes into the world of spirits. This philosophy has lost favor in philosophic circles in the last few years but it is so fully in harmony with the common intuitions of men that it will never be entirely suppressed. It is the philosophic basis of Theism and Christianity, and even of ethics, as they are generally understood.

\* Introduction to Philosophy p. 243.

Our Lord was not a philosopher. His method was widely different from that of the schools. He spake as one with authority. He did not reach his conclusions by a process of reasoning, as men are compelled to do, but by intuition. He stood so far above all other men that he could look over into spheres of truth about which they can only reason from probable premises. He alone, of the great teachers of the world, understood perfectly the true nature of life and the real meaning of death. This is the faith of all who believe in him as the incarnate Word.

He did not often use the word death, except when speaking of the nature and consequences of sin. He selects it as the best word by which to characterize the state we call spiritual death. When he uses it in reference to physical death he desired to emphasize some distressing feature connected with it. When he was foretelling the persecution of his followers and wanted to indicate its bitterness, he said: "And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father shall deliver up the son, and children shall rise up against parents and cause them to be put to death." Christians would be so hated that their enemies would inflict upon them the greatest of evils that they could conceive. In the same way he spoke of his own death: "They shall condemn him to death." In both cases he was speaking of it, not as he himself looked at it, but as men thought of it. He is quoting the penalty of one of the Mosaic laws when he said, "Let him die the death," and he is thinking of the fact that there is involved in the connection the idea of everlasting death. In describing the bitterness of his soul in the garden of Gethsemane he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." He was nearing the cross and he was beginning to feel that of which the Psalmist prophesied: "The pangs of hell gat hold on me." Our Lord was speaking of something more than mere physical death. In several places he gave utterance to his own personal conception of death. He said of the sickness of Lazarus, "This sickness is not unto death." Lazarus did die, showing that the Lord had some other conception of death than men generally enter-

tained. On another occasion he said, "If any man keep my sayings he shall never see death." He was not promising exemption from physical death but from those evils which men associated with it. In this same sense he said: "There be some standing here who shall not taste death until they see the Son of Man coming in his glory."

Our Lord's seeming dislike to the word has had several plausible explanations. Some have said that he avoided it because death was so repugnant to him. This is no doubt partly true. Death has its evils which he clearly saw and often felt. He knew the sorrows of bereavement, the loneliness of the home when a loved one has gone out never to return, the distress that befalls the family when the bread winner is taken away, the bitter disappointment when fondly cherished hopes are made impossible. He himself shed tears at the tomb of his friend Lazarus. He disliked death, too, because of its relation to sin. These things may have made the word repulsive to him.

But there may have been also some other reasons. The world has some false notions of death. It is not as great an evil as men generally believe. The word carries meanings that are not true. The dark side was so often presented that all view of the light beyond was shut off. Whenever the word was heard men thought only of the evils and not of the possible benefits that might come from it. Our Lord may have avoided the word while he was trying to awaken truer conceptions of death.

It is probable that our Lord did not often think of death. The spiritual was for him far more positive and important than the material. This present world is less real than the future. It is the world of shadows; the future, the world of substance. The earth had a beginning and will at length come to an end, but heaven is eternal. The mind is more real than the body. Death which closes the earthly life and carries the real self into the spiritual world seemed to him far less important than it does to us. Light from the higher sphere flashed back to him through the valley and seemed only a short pathway connect-

ing the two worlds. He saw through the veil which seems so dense to us. He did not think of death as often nor in the same way as we think of it.

His view of death is expressed in one significant word. He called it sleep. It was not absolutely new. Daniel uses it in a somewhat similar sense: "Many that sleep in the dust shall awake." If we belonged to that class of critics who ascribe all likeness of thought or expression to copying, we would say that our Lord borrowed it from that prophet. But it was an original conception, for he put so much new meaning into it, that it expresses a new thought. He said of the daughter of Jairus: "The maid is not dead but sleepeth." He said of the illness of Lazarus: "This sickness is not unto death." Afterwards he explained by saying: "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may wake him out of sleep." By that word he opens up an entirely new view of death. It excludes the idea of the destruction of either the soul or the body. It carries with it the promise of a resurrection. This much Daniel saw in it. But it also suggests thoughts of repose, of recuperation and reinvigorated life. If death is a sleep it is not what men think it is. It is not a great enemy to destroy us but a friend to give us rest from the worry and toil of the day of life. The new idea was eagerly caught up by the early Christians and the word passed into current use. Paul said of David: "He fell on sleep and was gathered unto the fathers." To the Thessalonians he wrote: "We shall not all sleep." "Those who sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him." And to the Corinthians: "Christ became the first fruits of them that sleep." The preciousness of the new thought is seen in the frequency with which it occurs in early epitaphs. "The sleeping place of Elpis;" "Zoticus is laid here to sleep;" "Laurinias, sweeter than honey, sleeps in peace;" "Domitianus sleeps in peace;" "Respectus who lived five years sleeps in peace." These are only a few out of many hundreds. It is still a precious word, and our favorite hymn in bereavement is

"Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep,  
From which none ever wake to weep."

Our Lord reveals still further his view of death by the manner in which he links the present to the future world. He calls his Church on earth the kingdom of heaven. His name for spiritual life is eternal life. Membership in his kingdom will not be disturbed nor the principle of the higher life be broken by death. The transition from this world to heaven will leave all our relations except the physical untouched. Christ is the life and those who live in him cannot die. When the bereaved Martha wanted to tell him about the sickness and death of Lazarus he sought to turn her attention to himself. "I am the resurrection and the life He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." She had too sad a view of death because she had failed to appreciate the life that he had brought into the world. If our life is hid with him in God we shall never taste death. Christ's person brings heaven and earth together. He makes the spiritual world present and real to our faith. The darkness of death is dissipated by the glory of Christ. He never commanded us to prepare for death but to watch for his coming. Death drops out of our view as we realize his idea of it as sleep, as it did with Paul when he said: "To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord." "As Christ is my life death is my gain." "I desire to depart and be with Christ." This was the vision of our Lord, rising very far above anything that was possible to the prophets, when he called death a sleep.

He looked at death as it was influenced by his own life. It is not what it would have been if he had never lived. Under the primeval curse it was to be an eternal separation of the soul and body. The soul, cut off from God and stripped of every element of moral and spiritual worth, was to be doomed to everlasting darkness. The body was to go back to dust and be lost in the elements of the earth. But Christ redeemed us from that curse and secured for us another probation. The penalty has been so modified even in the case of those who are finally lost that there is to be a general resurrection of the unjust as well as the just. Those who are saved, will be after

the final judgment, what they would have become if there had been no sin. Redemption changed the nature of death.

It is not what it was before his advent. The ancient Jews, both pious and wicked, all shrank from Sheol. They never thought of it as heaven, but as a dark underworld where the soul was in a semi-conscious state. Such a desire for death as Paul had was inconceivable to them. From the Greeks in the latter centuries they borrowed some ideas which they moulded into the doctrine of Hades as it is found in the works of Josephus. Some of them at the time of the advent believed, as Simeon did, that the Messiahs would change the condition of the departed saints. "Lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." He was willing now to die because he would not be compelled to remain long in Sheol. Most of the early Christian Fathers believed that Christ by his descent into Hades had emancipated those who had died in faith, and had taken them at his ascension to heaven. Paul was thought to have taught this when he said: "When he ascended up on high he led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. Now he that ascended what is it but that he first descended into the lower parts of the earth." Hebrews was interpreted in the same way: "These all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having reserved some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." This opinion of these Fathers was not wholly true, yet no one can prove that there was not an element of truth in it. Christ's descent into Hades and, as we believe, his descent into hell, was not without significance in the world of the dead. Peter says: "For, for this cause was the gospel preached unto them that are dead," etc. If he means, as he seems to do, after they were dead, an opportunity was given to some to rise into that spiritual state that made them immediate sharers in the fullest enjoyment of the benefits of his mission. We may turn from these interpretations, about which there may be reasonable doubt, to the fact that Christ's presence in heaven has added so much to its glory that the Apostles thought of it as being where he is.

That conception, so universal among these inspired men, was based upon the assurance that Christ's death and resurrection had changed the nature of death. He abolished death bringing life and immortality to light. He had taken away the sting of death. "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory."

Our Lord taught the separate existence of the soul in its fully conscious life after the death of the body. To the thief on the cross he said: "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise." He said that Lazarus "died and was carried by angels to Abrahams bosom," and that "the rich man died also and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torments." He quoted the Scripture to prove that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were still living, because God said I am the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. He regarded it as an unquestionable fact that God is not a God of the dead but of the living. He assumed on all occasions as a matter above doubt that at death there is a separation of the soul and body to continue only until the time of the resurrection. This is so evident that any effort to prove it seems superfluous.

This is the Christian faith. No science or philosophy has been able to prove that it is not reasonable and true. Prof. William James, of Harvard University, one of the foremost psychologists of our times, has found nothing in biology or psychology, or philosophy, to prevent him from believing that some communication with the dead may be possible. Dr. Osler is right when he says that physical science cannot prove a future life, but it is equally true that science cannot prove the contrary. Prof. Haeckel must have felt the force of our Lord's authority when he fished out of some cesspool a foul slander about the Virgin Mary in order to destroy it. Science has never been able to show the identity of the vital principle and the mind, nor that an individual life originating in the blending of the male and female cells may not be the organ of an entity that will survive the breaking up of the organism. An American statesman gave expression to no absurd or incredible sen-



timent when he said not long ago in a public address: "We are as sure that man lives beyond the grave as we are sure that he lives today."

We may add a few words in conclusion about the conquest of death. Philosophers have had a good deal to say upon this subject. Philosophy has been called a meditation upon death, and the ancient Greeks and Roman philosophers thought that one of its chief ends was to deliver us from the fears of death. Mr. Lecky gives us a summary of Crantor's Consolations. "Death is the only evil that does not afflict us when it is present. While we are, death is not; and when death has come, we are not. Death precedes as well as follows life. It is to be as we were before we were born." The dead man is as the unborn. Death is the end of all sorrows. It either secures happiness or is the end of all suffering. It is the last and best boon of nature, for it frees man from all his cares. Whether it be desired or whether it be shunned, it is no curse and no evil but simply the resolution of our being into its primitive elements, the law of nature to which it is our duty cheerfully to conform." \* Epicurus followed a similar train of thought. "If the soul retained full consciousness after death, and death were the transition of the soul to a higher life, as some Platonists maintain, we ought to rejoice at it instead of fearing it. Our fear of death is not caused by the dread of non existence, but by the fact that we combine with the idea of nothingness an idea of life, that is the notion of feeling the nothingness. If we could bravely relinquish all thought of immortality, death would lose its terrors. We would say to ourselves: "Death is not an evil, neither for him who is dead, for he has no feeling, nor for the living, because for him death doth not exist. As long as we live death does not exist for us, and when death appears we no longer exist. Hence we can never come in contact with death." † Stoicism was a better philosophy than Epicureanism or Platonism in the hands of such men as Crantor. Its stern sense of duty, of virtue for the sake of virtue, made men nobler

\* History of European Morals.

† Weber's History of Philosophy.

and braver. But its doctrine of fate made them apathetic. "It taught men to hope for little and fear nothing. It did not array death in brilliant colors as a path of felicity, but it endeavored to divest it, as the end of suffering, of every terror. Death seemed to be less terrible when it was regarded rather as a remedy than as a sentence. Life and death were attuned to the same key. The deification of human nature, the total absence of all sense of sin, the proud stubborn will, that deemed humiliation the worst of stains, appeared alike in each." It taught the duty of suicide at the call of fate. Zeno set the example. But suicide is the evidence of defeat in the battle of life rather than of victory over death. The heroism with which many met death was purchased at too great a cost. As a true conquest of death Stoicism was a failure.

Bacon's essay on death gives us the remedies proposed by the philosophy of a much later day. "The shadow of death terrifies more than death itself. Groans, convulsions, discolored face, weeping friends, and black raiment show death terrible. But there is no passion so weak but it mates and masters the fear of death. Revenge triumphs over it, love slights it, honor aspireth to it, grief flieth to it, fear preoccupieth it." "Death is a debt of nature. It is as natural to die as it is to be born. It extinguishes envy. In many cases there is little change in good spirits as death approaches." Shakespeare gave utterance to the same philosophy :

"The pain of death is most in apprehension,  
And the poor little beetle, that we tread upon,  
In corporal sufferance finds a pang as great  
As when a giant dies."

Hume's death, as described by Adam Smith, shows what philosophy may do in certain remarkable temperaments. "Though Mr. Hume always talked of his approaching dissolution with great cheerfulness, he never affected to make any parade of his magnanimity. He never mentioned the subject but when the conversation naturally led to it, and never dwelt longer upon it than the course of conversation happened to require." In the last letter he wrote he said : "I go very fast to decline

and last night had a small fever which I hoped might put a quicker period to this tedious illness but unluckily it has in great measure passed off." Dr. Black, his physician, said that "he continued to the last perfectly sensible. He never dropped the smallest expression of impatience." But perhaps the faiths and hopes instilled into his mind in childhood by his mother had as much to do with his heroic death as his philosophy, for at the time of his death he said to Adam Smith: "I do not think differently from other men about these things." Over his grave is written: "I am the resurrection and the life."

A monistic magazine in a recent number gave the pantheistic idea of the conquest of death: "Religion is the conquest of death." "Religion is the creation of a higher life and laying up imperishable treasures. It is no formula of confession; it is a moral oath; it is soaring above the home life of animal natures. Religious faith is not a belief in something that was two thousand years ago. It is confidence that we can do our duty, that we can gain the victory over matter, and that we can achieve the conquest of death." This is nothing but Stoicism under the name of religion. It is a cold, hard generalization without regard to the stern realities of death. It is simply this: Do your duty the best you can while you live and submit as gracefully as possible to death when it comes. We want bread but are given a stone.

Christianity proposes to meet the conditions as they really are and to overcome the fear of death by removing the causes. We fear death through an instinct which we have in common with all the animals. It belongs to animal life as a means of preserving it. That instinct cannot be eradicated, but like other instincts it may be inhibited. We often dread the pain of dying. Some fear it as the passage into an unknown world. Bacon says that such people are like children who are afraid to go alone into the dark. Many fear it because it interferes with cherished plans and thwarts their chief aims in life. All of us fear it because it severs our tenderest ties and breaks up our dearest associations. Every cord of affection draws us back from death. Only the homeless, friendless

and heartless can look forward to death with indifference. Death is the greatest of evils to those whose whole life is absorbed in the world.

"How dreadful must thy summons be, O Death,  
To him who is at ease in his possessions,  
Who counting on long years of pleasure here  
Is quite unfurnished for the world to come."

Death is often feared because of the fear of the punishments of the other world. Conscience testifies to the fact of sin and men dread the presence of the great judge.

Christianity proposes a prime relief from all these fears by giving us the assurance of another life. If men were certain of a future life they would not cling so tenaciously to the present life. Christianity gives certainty to our faith. The clear ring of the Apostolic "we know," has been caught up by thousands of faithful souls and enabled them to wrap the drapery of their couch about them and lie down as if to pleasant dreams. Gibbon correctly assigns this as one of the five great reasons for the triumphs of Christianity in the Roman world. This faith inhibits the instinctive loss of life and represses the merely animal fear of death. Christianity does not crush natural affections but sanctifies and strengthens it. It intensifies the pain of the final farewell. But it at the same time furnishes a balm. It gives assurance that the parting is not forever and that there will be a reunion under far better conditions. And while we are leaving some of our loved ones we are going to join others. Above all, we will see the Lord who loved us and gave himself for us, and whom we love with supreme affection. It gives not simply consolation but also great comfort.

Christianity removes all fear of future punishment. It does not, like Stoicism, deny the fact of sin but emphasizes it. It makes us realize more than simply natural conscience can do, that we are very guilty sinners and deserve everlasting punishment. It does not tell us, like Pantheism, that we must do the best that is in us and then give ourselves no further concern about the rest, but it tells us plainly that our best efforts

are failures and our highest righteousness falls very far short of our obligation. It directly contradicts the doctrine of Materialism, that death is the end of us and the idea of future retribution is a delusion, but it asserts in perfect accord with conscience that there is coming a day in which God will judge the world in righteousness. But it does tell us about the forgiveness of sins. "Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow." "Blessed is the man whose sins are forgiven and whose transgressions are covered." It has provided a way by which God can be just and yet justify the ungodly. "Christ is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world." Now because of Christ's righteousness imputed to us we are forgiven: "He that believeth on him is not condemned." "Being justified by faith we have peace with God." The Christian, resting upon these promises as being certainly God's promises, has the assurance that he will not come into condemnation but have the blessed life. He no longer shrinks from death through any fear of future punishment.

Christianity overcomes the love of the world by instilling the love of God. It not merely teaches the vanity of earthly things but also gives us heavenly mindedness. It gives power to cut off the affections that had been given to the world and to set them upon things above. It opens up treasures in heaven that far exceed in worth the best that can be found on earth. It enables us to realize that the things seen are temporal but the things unseen are eternal. Death is not a robber but the Christian's friend. Christianity is, then, the only real conquest of death. Christ has delivered those "who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage." Having triumphed over it he gives the victory to those who trust him. Buddha died tranquilly through the weakness and weariness of old age and amid the adorations of his disciples. He had repressed through a long life of asceticism the desire to live and had persuaded himself that having won an immortality of fame he was passing into Nirvana. Paul died triumphantly. He looked forward to a death by violence among enemies, but

he said: "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight. I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord will give me at that day and not to me only but unto all them that love his appearing."

"Jesus thou Prince of Life,  
Thy chosen cannot die,  
Like thee they conquer in the strife  
To reign with thee on high."

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE MODEL PREACHER.

BY REV. JACOB A. CLUTZ, D.D.

Our discussion in this paper has two limitations placed upon it by the subject itself. In a former number of *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* one of the editors has an article on *The Generic Idea of the Sermon*. (Dr. Richard in the number for January, 1906, page 112). At another place in this number will be found an article on *The Model Pastor*, by Dr. Bauslin, of the Wittenberg Theological Seminary. It is clear, therefore, that in asking the writer to prepare this paper on *The Model Preacher*, it was intended that he should lay the emphasis upon the specific function of *preaching*, and especially upon the preacher himself as a preacher, as a man who preaches.

The second limitation comes from the word "model." Not the preacher as he is, even at his best, but the preacher as he ought to be, the ideal preacher, is to be the subject of our study.

Before proceeding with the discussion, however, it may be well to ask what we are to understand by a preacher, and by preaching. How does preaching differ from any other oral address, and how does the preacher differ from any other public speaker who seeks to appeal to the minds or hearts of his fellowmen?

The definitions of preaching are almost as many and as varied as the authors who have made them. There are some

things, however, which they all include either by actual expression, or by implication, such as that the preacher is a man; that his message is to be delivered to men; that it is to be delivered orally, and that the substance of the message either is, or concerns, divine truth and the spiritual life of the soul. Therefore the preacher himself is a messenger, a herald, a voice, a prophet, a witness. All these terms, and others of similar import, are applied to the preacher in the Bible and in the literature of the Church dealing with the subject of preaching. The essential thing brought out by these terms is that the preacher occupies a representative position, and the one whom he represents is God. He does not speak for himself. He does not speak for the Church primarily, nor for any party in the Church. He speaks for God, and in his name and stead. Hence the word of St. Paul. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5: 20).

This lifts the preacher and his work of preaching upon a very high plane, both of dignity and responsibility, and calls not only for the best of men to fill such a high place, but also for the very best that is in even the best of men. It would be impossible, therefore, within the limits of such a paper, to discuss or even to present everything that goes to make up the model preacher, the ideal preacher. We can hope only to glance at some of the things that are most vital and essential. From among these we have selected five points which we wish to emphasize.

#### I. THE MODEL PREACHER MUST BE A THOROUGHLY GOOD MAN.

Voltaire is quoted as having said of Louis XIV., of France, that "He was not one of the greatest *men* but certainly one of the greatest *kings* that ever lived." Phillips Brooks, himself one of the greatest preachers of this country, commenting on this dictum of Voltaire's, says,— "It would not be possible to say that of any minister. He who was one of the greatest of ministers must be one of the greatest of men." (Yale Lectures on Preaching, p. 99). We might add that he must also be one of the best of men, for reasons that will appear as we go on.



The model preacher must be a good man physically. He must be physically sound and strong and healthful. It is true that some great preachers have been men of small stature, and of insignificant appearance. It is generally supposed that Paul himself was rather diminutive in size, and some think that he was stooped and lame, others that he had defective vision. There have also been great preachers, like Robert Hall, and Frederick W. Robertson, who have been weak in body and constant sufferers from chronic disease. But certainly this is not ideal and these are rare exceptions even in the history of preaching. The rule has always been that great preachers, like Beecher, and Hall, and Brooks, and Joseph Cook, of this country, and Spurgeon, and Liddon, and Parker, and Maclaren, of England, and Tholuck and others on the continent, not to go back to other generations, have been men with good bodies, and with superb health, and some of them have been physical as well as mental and spiritual giants. And surely this is the kind of an equipment that we would want to give, that we must give to the model preacher.

There are good reasons for this even aside from the fact that a large and wholesome looking man makes a better appearance in the pulpit, and is more likely to be able to command a hearing. Physical conditions, and the state of the health, and even the temperament, affect thought and disposition, and our way of looking at things, and of apprehending the truth, and also the way of presenting it. Every one knows how difficult it is, under certain physical conditions, to think clearly, or kindly and sweetly, or even to think at all; and how at other times, when every organ of the body is functioning right, the mind is clear-eyed, and the heart seems to be full of sweetness and light and the truth comes flashing in from every side like the rays of light from the sun shining in a cloudless sky. Hence it becomes a matter of duty, as well as of comfort and of privilege, for the preacher to keep his body always in the best possible physical condition.

The model preacher must also be well equipped mentally. We refer now simply to natural endowments. Later we shall have something to say of the need of education. But here it

is the capital stock with which he starts out that we have in mind. The idea that any kind of a man would do to make a preacher of, if it ever existed, and the many stale jests and stories that have been repeated in illustration of it, never had any real justification. No doubt some incompetents have got into the ministry, just as they have also in every other profession and occupation. Possibly they sometimes stick a little longer in the ministry than in any other profession, because it is more difficult to sift the ministry than other professions. But it is a mistake to think that they are better adapted to that work than to any other, or that those who have failed everywhere else can succeed there.

Attention is sometimes called to the fact that the twelve apostles of Jesus were all humble and unlearned men, with the implication that neither brains nor culture is a necessary equipment of a successful minister. But the subsequent history of these men, and of the Church which they founded, do not sustain such an implication. True, they were humble men, and they were unlearned, but they were not men of mean gifts, with whom nature had dealt parsimoniously. On the contrary, so far as we can know them at all, either from their writings or from their work, we know them as men of strong characters and of rich natural endowments. Especially was this the case with Peter and James and John, the immortal trio who seem to have been especially near to Jesus, and to have been especially trusted by him, and who came to be the recognized leaders in the little band, and to exercise the largest formative influence in the infant and apostolic Church.

No doubt it is true, as St. Paul says, that sometimes "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh may glory in his presence" (1 Cor. 1 : 27-29). But it is a notable fact, abundantly illustrated, and fully demonstrated, over and over again, in the history of God's dealings with men, that when he has any great work to do he always selects

a great man to do it, a man who is naturally great, who has apparently been born and equipped for just such a work and in many cases for just that work. In proof of this statement, we need only recall such royal men as Abraham, and Moses, and Joshua, and Samuel, and David, and Elijah and Elisha, and Daniel and Isaiah, and Peter and Paul, and a host of others, each of them a very prince among men, naturally fitted to fill a large place in the history and development of his day and race. And it has been equally true in the subsequent history of the Church and of the world. All the great leaders and teachers, the great theologians and preachers, the great reformers and statesmen, the great generals and rulers, the men who have carried the world on their shoulders and have lifted it up into the light and the truth, and into liberty and civilization, the men who have made history, all these have been men of rich natural endowment, men with great intellects, and great hearts and forceful wills, who could think great thoughts, and plan great things, and then push their thoughts and their plans to realization and accomplishment.

The "average man" has always been in evidence, and has always been useful. No doubt when the final summing up is made it will be found that by far the larger part of the world's best work has been done by the men of average capacity, the men to whom two talents have been given rather than five. And there has always been a place and a work for the man with only one talent who will not hide this talent away in the earth of indolence and neglect. But the five talent men have ever been the leaders and organizers, and inspirers, who have directed the work of the others, and pointed out the lines of least resistance, and the paths of greatest service, and without whom the work could never have been done as it was.

Never before in the history of the world was this so true as it is to-day. As the general level of intelligence rises, and the facilities for multiplying and using power are increasing, it requires every year more and more natural ability and force of character, as well as training, to enable a man to forge to the front, and secure recognition and leadership among men. This is true in the business world, and in the world of trade and in-

dustry. The great captains of industry, the merchant princes, the kings of finance, and not one whit less the leaders of the great labor organizations which are such a marked feature of the present age, are all men who have been cast in a large mould mentally, and some of them physically, men whom no untoward circumstances could keep down, and who were as sure to rise above the common level of men and to come to leadership and power, as the sun is sure to obscure the stars and to fill all eyes when it comes into the sky. It is equally true in the Church, and especially in the pulpit. The preacher of to-day, more than ever before, must be a strong and forceful man, if he is to secure a hearing for his message, or is to be recognized as a leader and teacher among men, with the right to tell them what to do and how to do it, or if he is to become an efficient and successful worker in and for the kingdom of God. He must be a man bright and keen in intellect, with a big glowing heart, and with a will that is discouraged by no obstacles, and knows no defeat. It is from among such men as this that we must look for the model preacher. And the more men of this kind that can be induced to enter the ministry, the stronger will the pulpit become, and the more influential and successful will the Church be. It is the standing lament in all the churches that in this commercial and wealth seeking age the strongest young men of the Church are all turning aside to business pursuits, and giving themselves to the making of money, and that only the weaker ones are left to enter the ministry. Probably the complaint is overstated, as such complaints usually are. But in so far as it is true, or justified by the facts, it is a most lamentable thing. The work of the ministry, and especially the work of the pulpit, calls for the very best young men the church has, and it is eminently worthy of them. No where else can they find a larger field or a better opportunity for the use of all their powers both of body and of mind and soul.

But above all else, and before all else, the model preacher must be a good man morally and spiritually. There is no other work that men are called to do in which the personality of the worker, and especially his moral and spiritual character,

counts for so much as in the work of preaching. There may have been some bad men who have sowed good seed in the pulpit, and God's Spirit may have honored the seed in spite of the unworthiness of the sower, and caused it to germinate and to bear fruit in other hearts and lives. But this is exceptional and abnormal. The bad preacher must have been able, in some way, to cover over his real character with a veneer of better profession and pretensions, that was accepted by the people as the real thing. Otherwise he never could have reached their minds and hearts, and persuaded them to accept and to obey truth to which he himself was not loyal. It is always hard, and well nigh impossible, to make other men believe what we do not believe ourselves, or to make them feel what we do not feel, or to induce them to do what we do not do. "If you would make me weep you must weep yourself," was the advice of Horace to the orator, and this advice is based on a sound philosophy and a wise observation of the relations of men to each other. And the tears must not be mere "crocodile tears." The emotion must be genuine, or must so well simulate the genuine that it cannot be distinguished from it. If it is not genuine, it will only provoke laughter and disgust.

So the model preacher must be genuine. He must be honest and sincere. He must himself believe what he wants others to believe. He must himself feel what he wants others to feel, and he must practice what he wants others to practice. In other words, if he wants his people to be good he must be good himself in this highest and best sense. It will be idle for him to say to his people "This is the way, walk ye in it," if he does not go before them. He must be able to say "This is the way, come let us walk in it together." Otherwise his exhortations will be in vain, and however much he may try to assume the appearance of sincerity, he will surely fail. His words will have a hollow ring to them like the tones of the phonograph, which, however near they may come to imitating the human voice, are never mistaken for it. Old readers of "*Pickwick Papers*" will remember how profoundly Mr. Winkle was impressed by the many drawers and boxes in the "surgery" of Bob Sawyer, the

fake young doctor, and what a shock he received when Bob said to him "Dummies, my dear boy; half the drawers have nothing in 'em, and the other half don't open." The preacher who merely pretends to piety and goodness need not tell his people that his pretensions are all "dummies;" they will soon find that out for themselves. The people generally are not so simple minded as Mr. Winkle. Phillips Brooks well says, "No man permanently succeeds in it [the ministry] who cannot make men believe that he is pure and devoted, and the only sure and lasting way to make men believe in one's devotion and purity is to be what one wishes to be believed to be." (*Yale Lectures on Preaching*, p. 51).

II. THE MODEL PREACHER MUST BE A MAN OF BROAD AND GENEROUS CULTURE.

If we be reminded here again, as we sometimes are, that the apostles, and even Jesus himself, the greatest preacher of all the ages, were unlearned men, our answer is ready.

Jesus was divine as well as human. Though he had never learned letters, (John 7 : 15) he had all the treasures of wisdom for his own. He was filled with all the fulness of God, (Col. 1 : 19), and to him the Spirit was given without measure (John 3 : 34). He belongs, therefore, to a class by himself and while he is, in some respects, a model for all other preachers, as he is for all other men, no other preacher can ever excuse himself from the need of study and education because Jesus was not trained in the schools. He is not Jesus Christ.

Much the same thing must be said of the apostles. They were "unlearned men" (Acts 4 : 13), and in this sense they were also "ignorant" men. But they were by no means untrained. For two years or more they were almost constantly in the company, and under the instructions, of the greatest teacher of morals and religion the world has ever known. What college, or university, or theological seminary, of the present day, with all their learned faculties, and boasted equipment, can offer a course of study that is equal to those days with the Master himself? Moreover they had the advantage of a special baptism of the Holy Spirit and a special inspiration,

promised to them by Jesus, before he left them, and actually given on Pentecost and continued with them to the end of their ministry. Their work also was quite different from that of the ordinary preacher of to-day. It was a work of revelation and of evangelization, and of laying foundations. It is doubtful whether any one of them ever preached a single sermon in the modern sense of the word, and certainly no one of them ever was a settled pastor. The very nature of their office and work precluded that. Besides, when all is said, it must ever be remembered that after all, Paul, the man who did more actual preaching, so far as the record goes, than all the rest of them put together, and who wrote fully one third of the New Testament Scriptures, and who had more influence in shaping the subsequent thought and life of the Christian Church, than any other one, save Jesus himself, was a trained thinker who had enjoyed the best advantages of education that were available in his day and among the Jewish people.

Sometimes we are reminded also that some of the most successful evangelists of modern times, such as Mr. Moody and Evan Roberts, have been, or are, plain and unlettered men. But these are exceptional also, both as individuals and as to their work. Most of the great evangelists, like the great preachers, have been well educated men, and they have all been exceptional men in other respects, men who seem to have received a special "gift" for this kind of work. Very few of them, it may be remarked, have been or ever could have been successful as settled pastors. It is very certain that Mr. Moody especially, of whose career more has been made in this respect than of that of any other man, never could have sustained himself from year to year in the same pulpit, and no one better understood his limitations in this direction than he did himself. Consequently he always deprecated, both publicly and privately, the unfair and invidious comparisons which were sometimes made by thoughtless people between his work and that of the regular ministers who were the pastors of churches.

Further, it needs to be said that the success of these men, whether evangelists or apostles, did not come from, nor because of their lack of training in the schools, but rather in spite of



it. Ignorance never made any man great, neither has it ever made any man successful, either in the ministry or in any other calling. Some ignorant men have been successful and perhaps a few ignorant men have been great, but it has been because of other qualities or circumstances, and in spite of their ignorance, not by reason of it. God may be able to use ignorant and unlettered men to accomplish his great purposes in the world, and sometimes he may elect to do this in order thereby to magnify his own agency and glory, but as we have already seen that God has generally chosen really great men to perform great tasks, so history proves also that He has usually selected men who were well prepared. It is a valid and entirely conclusive retort, when in answer to the assertion that God did not need our learning to help him to save the world, some one said, "Much less does he need our ignorance."

If there ever was a day when uneducated men could be useful in the ministry that day has passed away with the multiplication of schools, and the general diffusion of knowledge, which is so striking a characteristic of the present age. Every congregation of average size to-day has in it men and women who are well educated themselves and who are constant readers and students. Nearly every such congregation has among its members some men and women who are college or university graduates, and who are engaged in some form of professional work. These men and women will not be content to sit under the ministry of a man of less general culture than themselves. They may not expect their pastor to know as much as they do in their special department, but if he is to command their respect, he must know more than they do in some other departments, and especially in his own departments, and he must have enough general training to keep him from making constant mistakes in grammar, or in regard to the facts of history or of science, and from violating all the laws of logic and of reason.

The model preacher, at least, therefore, must be an educated man, and his education should cover at least these four lines:

First, he should have a fair knowledge of the leading facts of history and of science. He should also have a good gen-

eral acquaintance with the history of philosophy, and with the best literature of his own tongue if not of all tongues. It would take us too far afield to enter upon any very elaborate discussion of the reasons for all this, nor is it necessary. He needs it for his own culture, to save him from narrowness and bigotry. He needs it to enable him to sympathize with the thought and life of other men, and to know how to put himself into their places so that he may be able to look at things from their standpoint and to meet them on common ground, and to reason with them and instruct them in spiritual things. He needs it also for the purposes of illustration and illumination, and in order to present the truth in an attractive and forceful way so as to command a hearing and drive his lessons home to the minds and hearts of all classes of hearers.

He should also in these days, have a good knowledge of the social and economic problems which are agitating the minds of thoughtful men in all the walks of life, and the right solution of which is so important to the future welfare of society, and to the progress of both the Church and the kingdom of God. It may not be his province to preach either economics or sociology in a technical and formal way. But a preacher, in this age, can hardly expect to interest men in his message, if he does not know how to apply the gospel to present day conditions and problems. And he must know enough about them not to make mistakes and misstatements that will arouse antagonism, or bring upon him the ridicule and contempt of the most thoughtful people in his congregation.

He must also know what the trend of thought and investigation is in his own special fields of study, in theology, and church history, and in exegesis and biblical criticism. This does not mean that he is to accept all the vagaries of self-constituted leaders in thought, nor that he is to be carried away by every new wind of doctrine that sweeps across the ecclesiastical heavens. Just the opposite. He must know enough about these subjects to be able to form an opinion for himself, and not to be frightened into giving up all his long cherished beliefs as soon as somebody declares that "the consensus of all

modern scholarship" is against them. The consensus of "all modern scholarship" has not yet been reached.

Indeed, the model preacher ought to know something of every branch of knowledge, and he ought to be a master in those branches which more directly concern his own particular work of preaching the gospel of Christ to a perishing world.

Secondly, the model preacher should be sufficiently familiar with the rules of logic, and with modern methods of investigation, to enable him not only to reason logically himself but also to detect and expose the fallacies and false reasoning of others. This does not mean that he is to turn his pulpit into a theological arena in which he is to wage constant battle with either the imaginary or the real enemies of the faith. He may and probably should do very little of this. But if he is to teach others the truth, he must be able to think clearly and logically for himself, so as to guard his own mind from error, on the one hand, and to be able to follow out new and interesting investigations on the other hand. This training is important also that he may be able to state the truth to others clearly and convincingly, and to marshal such arguments and proofs as will compel the assent even of unwilling minds.

Thirdly, the model preacher should be trained in the use of language so as to be able to state the truth attractively as well as clearly. He should be able to speak and to write well. He should be a master of the art of expression. Often as much depends on the way a truth is put as upon the truth itself. An elegant style should never be made an end in itself, and the ornaments of speech should never be used so profusely as to overlay and conceal the truth itself. No doubt preachers often darken counsel by words without knowledge. But when a truth or exhortation is well expressed, it always will have a better chance of success than if stated awkwardly, or barely and bluntly, without anything to appeal to the imagination or to the taste. Many an error has found currency because it has been clothed in a handsome dress of literary ornamentation, while the truth has languished by its side just because it was sent out in homespun.

Fourthly, The model preacher should be trained properly

in the utterance of truth. The vocal expression of the preacher's message is no less important, rather more important if anything, than its literary expression. A good delivery may make up for many deficiencies in form, but a bad delivery is likely to ruin the best sermon that ever was prepared, and to render it wholly ineffective. The delivery of a sermon is to the sermon very much what the aiming of the gun is to its discharge. Probably we all recognize the truth of this, and yet hardly anything else is so neglected in the training of the preacher at the present day as vocal culture and the art of delivery. Many a man who has all the other qualities necessary to the making of a good preacher, if not a model preacher, fails to attract the people, and therefore fails to instruct and help them, because of a faulty delivery.

Every college in which young men are being prepared for the ministry, and especially every theological seminary, ought to have a department of voice culture, with a competent professor in charge, who would know how to teach young men to avoid those faults of delivery of which preachers are more frequently guilty than any other class of public speakers, and to cultivate those graces of oratory which are essential to the highest success in persuading men. The words elocution, and elocutionist, have been studiously avoided because they are in bad repute, and justly so, and are liable to be misunderstood. Voice culture, and the art of public speech, are different things, and are wholly good if wisely done, and are a most essential part of the model preacher's equipment for his work.

III. WE COME NOW TO STILL DEEPER, OR HIGHER, AND MORE VITAL THINGS WHEN WE SAY THAT THE MODEL PREACHER MUST HAVE A PASSION FOR THE TRUTH.

Or, should we say that he must be possessed by the passion for truth? They mean the same thing practically, but the former is, perhaps, the better form of expression, because it makes the man to dominate the passion rather than the passion to dominate the man, and this is well even in the passion for truth. In either case it means that the model preacher must have an earnest, eager, passionate desire to know the truth and to be loyal to it. Not merely to know things, or to know facts.

This might seem to be the same thing, but it is not. Some men have a great desire to know, but it is little more than curiosity, and is satisfied with a wholly superficial information that does not stop or care to look into the very heart of the things known to discover whether they are really true or not. Much of our so-called knowledge is of this character, and is far from the truth. Truth is the correspondence of conception with reality. But we know how often we need to correct our conceptions because they do not correspond with reality, and therefore are not true. We know how often we speak of knowing things when we do not know them, and cannot know them, because they do not exist. A superficial, or thoughtless nature may be able to rest satisfied with this superficial kind of knowledge, or so-called knowledge, but not a great and earnest soul such as every preacher ought to be, and such as every true preacher is, and the model preacher above all must be. He wants to know not only things but the reality that lies back of or below the things, the real truth of things. For this he searches, and probes, and digs, as for hid treasures, and nothing else can ever satisfy him. Like Jesus he feels that he has come into the world to bear witness to the truth, (John 18 : 37), and how can a man bear witness to that which he does not know or of which he is not sure ?

Neither is this passion a limited one in its area or aim. It will not be content with the knowledge of simply one kind of truth, as theological or spiritual truth. It will want to know all kinds of truth, the truth of history, and the truth of science, and the truth of philosophy, and the truth of art as well.

Of course we must recognize the fact that no mere man can ever know all the truth in all these departments, nor perhaps in any one of them. Only God, the infinite being, can do that. But men can and ought to desire to know all truth. They can and ought to hunger and thirst after the truth, as well as after goodness, righteousness. Especially should the preacher, who above all other men, is the servant and teacher of the truth, have this longing, this ardent desire. The model preacher has it.

At the beginning it was the desire to become wise, and to

know good and evil, even as God knows them, that was the undoing of our first parents. But this was not because the desire itself was wrong, but only because they allowed themselves to be seduced into a false way of satisfying it by eating of the forbidden fruit. If they had obeyed God and remained loyal to him, the desire would no doubt have been legitimately met and responded to by God, with a fuller and more glorious revelation of the truth than has ever been possible since sin has entered into the world, and has blinded men's eyes and perverted their judgment. But this at least is to man's credit, that he has carried the desire itself over the fall, and kept it alive through all the generations since, even though it has sometimes burned very feebly, and has been all too easily stilled.

But of course it is especially spiritual truth that the preacher desires and seeks for. The truth about God, and about man, and sin and salvation, and the life to come, as they are revealed in the Bible, and experienced in the lives of God's children, and expressed in the history and faith of the church, these are the truths which, above all others, and more than all others, the preacher should desire and seek. This is the preacher's true kingdom where he should feel most at home, and where he should be most determined on mastery and kingship. If he does not know these truths at least reasonably well he is not fit to be a teacher of others. If he is not passionately eager to know them more and more fully and clearly he has missed his calling, and would better be engaged in some other kind of work.

This passion for truth will make the true preacher a constant student. It will also save him from narrowness and bigotry, and will keep his mind and heart open to all the light that may come to him from any direction, or from any source whatever. Too many preachers cease to study when they leave the theological seminary. It is to be feared, indeed, that too many never really learned to *study*, even in the seminary or the college. They have only prepared recitations, and this not always very well. They have never really studied, never made the pursuit of knowledge and the search for truth, a serious business. When they get out into the ministry they may prepare

sermons, at least for a while, but they cease to prepare themselves to preach. They do little solid and earnest reading. They buy few or no new books. They make little use of their old ones, which they have by no means exhausted. They gather no new stores of material, and in a few years they are exhausted, and if they keep on preaching at all, make frequent changes and preach over the same old round of thoughts and illustrations, and even of sermons, much like a horse that is hitched to the lever of an old fashioned horse-power, and keeps on walking monotonously and stupidly around, and around, and around in the same path.

Others, who do keep up their habits of study, become narrow and pinched in their views. Their study is all in one line, and has for its end mainly the confirmation of their own views already held, or the proof of the doctrines of their church, or the refutation of their opponents, rather than the discovery of truth. These become the bigots of the Church, and of the pulpit, our modern Pharisees, who are so sure that they are right that they will not listen to any one who differs with them, no matter how well he may be authenticated, but are ready to attack him at once and to seek his ecclesiastical if not his physical life. It is to save him from all this that the model preacher needs a passion for truth, and to make him a sane and safe leader for others, and an enthusiastic teacher.

"Let there be many windows in your soul,  
That all the glory of the universe  
May beautify it. Not the narrow pane  
Of one poor creed can catch the radiant rays  
That shine from countless sources: Tear away  
The blinds of superstition: let the light  
Pour through fair windows, broad as truth itself  
And high as heaven."

This passion for truth will also keep the preacher loyal to the truth in his pulpit and in all his work. This is no less important than the other. Two temptations or perils beset the preacher in this line. One is to preach what he thinks he ought to preach rather than what he really believes to be true. It is to be feared that in these days of mental and spiritual unrest not a few preachers have lost their firm grip on the old



truths which they have been wont to preach, and which they know they are still expected to preach. Where this has come to pass the preaching of many is only an echo of their past beliefs and experiences, or a lifeless reflection from the accepted creeds of their churches, rather than the full and hearty expression of their own present experience and deep convictions. Such preaching can never ring true in the ears of the people, nor carry conviction to them. It was because the apostles spoke only the things which they had seen and heard (Acts 4 : 20) that so many believed and were added to the Church under their ministry. Sincerity, absolute sincerity, must mark all the utterances of the model preacher, as it ever marked all the words of Jesus and of his apostles. A man would far better leave the pulpit than to become a false witness by preaching in a merely mechanical or perfunctory way, things which he does not really believe, or of the truth and reality of which he has no deep and earnest persuasion.

The other temptation is to preach to please men, or to modify his statements of the truth, or to give or withhold the truth, according as he knows it will be acceptable or offensive to his hearers. This temptation sometimes becomes very strong, especially when it involves not only the preacher's popularity, but also his bread and butter, and the holding of his place. But woe to the man who yields to it and in so doing compromises the truth. He also becomes a false prophet, and proves disloyal not only to the truth, but also to himself and to the people over whom the Holy Ghost has made him an overseer. The man who has the passion for truth, who really loves the truth and lives for it, would rather sacrifice his life itself, than to sacrifice the truth to either the pride or the prejudice of his hearers. Like Paul he ever speaks "not as pleasing men, but God." (1 Thess. 2 : 4).

#### IV. THE MODEL PREACHER MUST ALSO HAVE A PASSION FOR MEN.

His passion for the truth must not terminate in the truth itself, nor in himself as a searcher for truth. He must not study simply to know the truth, nor for the mere pleasure that he may find in knowing or discovering it, but in order that he

may use it in teaching others, and in leading them into the truth. A man might be possessed of a passion for truth, and yet be supremely selfish. Many students are so. They spare no pains to find out the truth, but when it is found they simply go on to find more truth. They never think of taking the truth they have discovered, and going out with it into the world and using it to make other men wiser and better and happier. They are like the hunter who finds all his delight in killing the game and simply lets it lie where it falls, while he presses on in the hope of shooting more.

Other students find the reward of their labor in the mere joy of finding the truth, and knowing that they possess it, and they hug it to their bosoms, and hug themselves in deep satisfaction, with as little thought for others as the class just considered. These are like misers who gather gold simply for the joy of having it, and who hoard it up, and gloat over it, and call themselves rich, while all around them men may be hungry and dying for lack of the food which they might easily give but will not.

It is of course apparent at once that the model preacher could not possibly belong to either one of these classes. He must pursue the truth for the sake of his fellows as well as for his own sake, and when he has found it he must take it to them, and try to make them to know it also, in order that it may make them free as it has made him free.

His passion for men must lead him to seek their salvation also. He sees in them the sons of God, but lost sons who are in imminent danger of eternal destruction from his presence. He cannot think of this without pain, nor without the impulse to try to rescue them from their peril. He knows their infinite worth. He knows that they were created in the image of God. He knows that they were created for God. He knows that they have been redeemed with the precious blood of Christ. He knows that they are his brothers, of the same flesh and blood as himself. Hence he loves them with a great yearning love, resembling in kind, even if it cannot approach in degree, the love which God himself has for them, and which moved

him to give his only begotten Son that they might not perish but have everlasting life.

But this passion for men, if deep and genuine, will not rest content with the salvation of men from eternal death and for the future world. It will desire to see them saved here and now, in this world and for this life. When we remember how entirely almost the Church, and especially the ministers, have laid the stress upon this kind of future salvation, it is surprising and startling indeed, to turn to the Bible, and especially to the words of Jesus, and to see how little stress is laid upon it there comparatively. It is recognized, and its importance is duly emphasized. But the main stress is laid upon salvation in this life—salvation not only from the guilt and future penalty of sin, but from its present power and blight, so that men may follow Jesus here and now, and “live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.” (Titus, 2: 12.)

This is not because future salvation is not a great thing, and infinitely important, but because present salvation is just as great and important, and because if men are saved in this life they need have little concern about the life to come. That will take care of itself. The model preacher must understand and appreciate this, and he must feel towards men as Jesus did when looking upon the great unfed multitudes, they seemed to him like an unshepherded flock, scattered abroad upon the mountains, and he had compassion on them and fed them to the full.—(Matt. 9: 36; 15: 32–37). Such a sympathy and compassion must be in the true preacher's soul as he goes about his work among men, and he also is moved to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked, and to visit the sick and the imprisoned, and to minister to each and to all according to their several needs.

It is such a passion for men that ought to move men to enter the ministry. It is this that must keep them at work in the ministry in spite of all the difficulties and discouragements, so that even when men reject their ministry, or fail to respond to it, instead of giving them up in disgust, or in despair, the model preacher only loves them and pities them the more, because this is to him only one more proof of their great and pressing need for help and guidance, if they are to be saved at all.

It is this passion for men that makes the preacher's work a delight to him, and it is only when he really enjoys his work that he can do it efficiently and successfully. In a recent number of the *Ladies Home Journal*, President Roosevelt is quoted as saying in answer to a question as to how he is able to endure all the burdens of his office and work,—“It is because I like my job.” This is the secret of comfort and success in any work. The preacher who does not like his job, and find pleasure in it, and especially the preacher who does not like to preach, is to be pitied indeed. And there is only one thing that can contribute more than this passion for men, towards making the preacher really enjoy his work, and this is the last characteristic of the model preacher that we shall discuss.

V. THE MODEL PREACHER MUST HAVE A PASSION FOR GOD.

A passionate desire to know God in Christ Jesus and to have fellowship with him, and to make him known to others and to bring them to know him and to have fellowship with him, this is the last, the highest, the crowning characteristic of the model preacher.

To know God and to live in fellowship with him, is the highest privilege open to men. To bring our fellowmen to know God and to live in fellowship with him, is the highest service we can render to others. This has always been the supreme desire and joy of the truly devout of all ages. The Psalmist cries, “As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?” (Psalm 42 : 1, 2). And in the fifty-first Psalm he prays for the restoration of the joy of God's salvation, and to be upheld by his spirit, to this end; “Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee.” (Psalm 51 : 13). So the apostle says, “For to me to live is Christ and to die is gain” (Phil. 1 : 21), and again and again he exhorts believers to “rejoice in the Lord” (Phil. 4 : 4). Even Jesus himself found relief from weariness and pain, and from the contradiction of sinners, in prayer and communion with his heavenly Father, and declared that his meat was to do the will of him that sent him, and his Father's will for him just at that time

was that he should lead a poor, benighted Samaritan woman into a better knowledge of God and of the right way of worshipping him. And so it has always been with all the great and the good.

This passion for God, however, must look Godwards as well as manwards. It is not only that men may know God and have communion with him for their own joy and peace, but also for his satisfaction and eternal glory. The old Westminster catechism says that "the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever." It does well to put the glory of God first, for that is the first and the highest of all, and must never be lost sight of.

This passion for God is the preacher's true balance wheel and safety valve. It is this that will keep every other desire and ambition in its proper place, and give to it its proper due, no more and no less. It will keep him from glorying in any special gifts that he may have as though he had not received them from above. It will keep him from being puffed up by reason of any advantages of training and culture that he may have enjoyed beyond the members of his flock, and cause him to remember that these too are the gifts of God entrusted to him in order that he may be a better and more successful workman for him. It will keep his passion for truth from becoming cold and selfish, and his passion for men from descending into a weak and foolish sentimentalism. It will deliver him also from all fear of men, on the one hand, and from the temptation to sacrifice either truth or duty simply to please them, or to win either their admiration or their applause.

Nothing has been said thus far about a number of things that we might have been expected to discuss in a paper on the model preacher. Methods of study, and methods of sermonizing, and methods of delivery, have been ignored, not because they are deemed unimportant, but because of the conviction that all such questions will readily adjust themselves whenever and wherever the characteristics of the model preacher on which we have insisted are actually present. None of these things are really vital in and of themselves. In determining them every man must be a law to himself in large measure. Whether a man shall write his sermons, or carefully think them

out, or only prepare an outline and leave both the development of the thought and its phrasing to the heat of delivery; whether he shall read his sermons from manuscript, or commit them and deliver them memoriter, or preach extemporaneously; whether he should preach expository sermons or topical, doctrinal or practical, experimental or ethical; whether he should preach twenty minutes or fifty, these and a whole host of questions of similar import cannot be settled by rule for all preachers at once, but must reach a solution through each individual man's own personal experience and convictions of duty and expediency. But that a preacher should be pious, and capable, and especially that he should be loyal to the truth, that he should be interested in men and devoted to their highest welfare, and that he should love and fear God and desire above all things to serve and please him, these are the things that are essential. Here there can be no surrender, no compromise, no difference of opinion. There may be differences of degree in attainment, but every one of these things is fundamental, and the degree of attainment simply marks the measure of approach of each individual preacher to the model for all.

And if any of our readers should think that the standard has been placed too high, we would only repeat in closing what was said in the beginning, that our subject calls for the discussion of the model or ideal preacher, not of what is but of what ought to be. No doubt there is a great host of earnest and effective preachers, who are not models in all respects, but who are still doing splendid work both for men and for God. But we believe that it will be safe to say that the measure of their success will be found in every case to be just in proportion to their approach to the model which we have tried to describe, and to the degree in which they possess the five characteristics of the model preacher discussed. The model for this great work should be a lofty one, and should always be kept in advance of anything that has yet been attained, or that is easily attainable, either by ourselves or by any of our brethren. When the ideal has been fully realized it ceases to be the ideal and becomes the actual. Then there is nothing more left to which to look forward, or after which to strive, and progress will cease.

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE MODEL PASTOR.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

The spiritual greatness of the work of the Christian minister is incomparably beyond that of any other vocation. He engages in a work that a man receives from God. True, he is publicly ordained and thus set apart by the laying on of human hands; but the voice that calls him unto his work is not human; the authority that commissions him is not human, and neither is the tribunal at which at last he must render an account of his stewardship. He is the "minister of God" appointed to bring to men a message from the Most High, and accountable in his high and sacred responsibility to Him who has thus sent him.

There are various theories of the ministry and of ecclesiastical administration, but there is no room for difference on this point that all duly called and qualified ministers in the Church of Christ come to their people with a commission from the Lord who reigns on high. Hence the dignity, arduousness and importance of the noblest of all vocations. The Christian minister is an ambassador in Christ's stead. He is a steward of the mysteries of God. He is a public and duly accredited servant of his Lord and Master, the Saviour and Friend of mankind, who, having given himself a ransom for all, would have all men to be saved. His high commission authorizes him to declare the love and grace of the Lord to all to whom he is sent, to feed their hungering souls with the bread of life, to warn them of the dangers in the way of their salvation, to set before them the deceitfulness of sin, to show them how to escape from the evil that is in this present world and how to attain unto the blessedness of that world which is to come. Nothing greater indeed can be contemplated by any man than to become an honored and efficient instrument for the salvation of human souls and the enlargement of the Kingdom of God.



The office is of such solemn importance and meaning that even the most sincere and successful among the Lord's chosen servants, in the consciousness of his own insufficiency may lose his confidence in contemplating its requirements and responsibilities and cry out "who is sufficient for these things?" Who is so wise, so holy, so self devoted as to be worthy to stand among his fellowmen in the noisy places and in the quiet places of the present life, in the public ministration of the Word and sacraments and in the quiet and unostentatious "cure of souls," as an accredited and authorized messenger from the King of Kings?

In the religious use of the Word a pastor is one who shepherds souls. His work is thus a distinctive spiritual work, a work that deals with the motives, ideals, purposes and conduct of the people whom he tries to help. All the benefits accruing from the facts of the Redemptive history he is attempting to make applicable to the hearts of the men, the women and the children who are about him. He is devoted to the welfare of his fellowmen and is anxious to benefit them in every phase of their living, eager to induce them to become fellow-heirs and citizens of the Kingdom of God. As a good and benevolently disposed man he stands ready to counsel in household cares, in business perplexities and in all temporal and material affairs. But the chief desire of the shepherd of souls toward other men is this, that he may reach and bless the seat of all their joy and sorrow, the source of all their ambition and purpose—the soul. The first and last element in every man's character is the soul, that which is within him that admits of likeness unto God. The christian pastor is set apart for the care of this, and it is because of this supreme fact that his mission among men is greater than any other mission of beneficence entrusted to men. His errand is not only great, but definite and practical. It is to win that within a man which makes him a man and in the winning of which the municipality and the nation are both won. Next to the sense of the greatness of the message, therefore, the minds of all right-minded people should be occupied with the man who is entrusted with the message.

A calling so important and comprehensive in its design as that now under consideration necessarily involves a vast number and a great variety of duties. Preaching and the more distinctive work of the pastor have a common object, but employ somewhat different, though never antagonistic, means for its accomplishment. Preaching awakens attention, arouses conscience, proclaims the law, offers the grace and mercy to be found in Christ and persuades men to be reconciled to God. In pastoral oversight and care the minister feeds the flock of Christ, nourishes and cherishes the lambs of the fold, gives milk to the babes and strong meat unto them who are of full age, to every one according to his capacity and need.

It is the preaching of the gospel that introduces the great claims of religion. It is the pastoral care which establishes and perpetuates the institutions of Christianity. It is preaching that enlarges the area of Christian influence. It is pastoral care that individualizes the application and consolidates the results of pulpit labor, increasing attendance upon preaching and securing interested hearers. It is preaching that attracts hearers within the circle of pastoral influence, but it is the pastoral care which waters the seed sown in their hearts. It is the preaching of the word that makes aggressions into the country of the enemy of souls, but it is pastoral care that follows as the work of occupation. It is preaching that challenges attention and arouses inquiry. It is pastoral care that removes doubts, settles anxieties, which imparts needed consolation and instruction. It is in preaching that the true minister of Christ unfolds and defends the truth of God. It is in pastoral fidelity that he consolidates, watches and guards the gathered flock. When the preaching, however excellent it may be, is not followed or duly sustained by pastoral care it fails of its ultimate effects. Churches in which preaching is neglected grow weak in numbers and spirituality, are liable to run away into ritualistic ceremonies and barren formalities and lose their hold on thinking people. Churches in which pastoral care is minimized lose their organic power, and tend to dissolution. Their organiza-

tion is ineffective and the true spirit of the body of Christ languishes.

Accordingly the Christian minister in the faithful prosecution of the distinctively pastoral phases of his vocation has come to no flowery beds of ease, in doing the work done when He was on the earth by his Lord and Master, who loved men, fed men, led men, protected men and was at last willing to die for men. The brave and devoted under shepherd must do it all if he finds in Christ his example. There is pastoral work to be done and in its prosecution he must aim to be like the great Apostle who in the fulfilment of his ministry could say, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly and from house to house." There too is the solemn, delicate and difficult duty of visiting the sick. There also are the poor to be looked after and comforted, and the Sunday School and other congregational organizations that need oversight, direction and counsel. Enough it is to tax time, patience, strength and sensibilities.

The office of the pastor has a three fold bearing and relation, in consequence of the fact that in a broad sense, he has to deal with three classes of persons.

There is a class composed of all who have not yet entered upon the duties and joys of the Christian life, but who are still moving in the vain ways of worldliness and sin. To these lost sheep who have wandered away from the good shepherd the Christian pastor owes something. It is a part of his duty to go after them in persistent and loving efforts to bring them back into the fold. Then again there are the young at their different stages. He is to look upon them as an heritage of the Lord and the heirs of the future, and his office requires him to deal with them according to the loving example of the Lord and to neglect no opportunity for training them into a knowledge of the truth and to lead them into a joyous and intelligent confession of the Lord. The third class with which the pastor has to deal is included under such as are already members of the congregation of believers, such as have laid hold upon the hope set before them in the gospel. Such he is to instruct,

edity, comfort and warn. His work of love among them must be to "preach the Word, to be instant in season, out of season, to reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine; to watch in all things, to endure afflictions, to do the work of an evangelist; to make full proof of his ministry." He must strive at all times to carry out the exhortation of Peter the apostle, which contains a short but complete Pastoral Theology: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage; but being ensamples to the flock."

The question therefore recurs, What manner of man should he be who contemplates prosecuting these manifold duties, to these separate classes, with any fair degree of success? To attain to what might be regarded as "model" in them all would seem to involve a perfection that transcends all human possibilities. Nevertheless there are certain requisites that condition even fair success. It is an antecedent presumption that the model pastor must be a good man. The foundation of influence in parochial life is in the pastor's character and the root of that character is piety. An ordinary excellence is not enough. By his very position he is forbidden to be a secular member of the community, and hence must not be secular either in his character or his habits. True it is, in our estimate, that the pastors office does not segregate him into a separate and priestly caste, but he does fulfil among men the functions of a sacred vocation. Passing by with this single reflection, this fundamental factor in the pastor's life and work, there are other marks of the model in the fulfilment of this high office to which we may find it profitable to advert.

1. We may be permitted first of all to say that the model pastor is going to be a real man, a man of flesh and blood and infirmities like other men. But what we mean is not so much that fact, but this requisite that there must be about the Christian pastor, in all his relations with people, the element of realism. There is a bitter epigram—bitter but containing some truth at least—that "more evil is done in the world by unreal

men than by wicked men." One of the Presidents of our country was once asked when he was a small boy what he was going to be. He made this reply: "First of all I shall try to be a man; and if I do not succeed in that, I am quite sure that I shall not succeed in anything else." In Scott's story, in reply to the question, "Who are you?" Rob. Roy replies "I am a man, a man, that is very brief, but it serves one who has no other answer to give. In the pastoral office, in the long run, woe be to the man who is not what the voluntary assumption of his high calling proclaims him to be, a real and genuine man, of the noblest and most disinterested order. In the theological seminary, behind text book and lecture room and chapel hour and devotional service, there should always stand the man. In the pastorate, likewise, behind the parochial visitation as well as behind the sermon in the pulpit a real man is supposed to stand. There is one profound difference between that sort of public speaking which is known as preaching and any other kind of public discourse, that the subject matter and the commission of the preacher alike make it impossible to dissociate the man from his message. Unreality in the every day life will invariably nullify the acceptability and influence of the public utterance.

"The two great elements in preaching," said that great soul and unique preacher, Phillip Brooks, "are personality and truth." The truth must come through the man and not merely over him. We shall as pastors very likely be what we are as men. A maxim that was originally applied to artists is certainly more true of a Christian pastor "as we are so is our work." Manhood, and manhood that is distinctively and emphatically real, is a pastoral prerequisite. There must be a real harmony between the man and his message, if the pastoral impact is to amount to anything. The man who is going to mingle successfully with other men in the "Cure of souls," must be a real man and not a mere segment or semblance of a man. He is to be a man among men with his feet upon this earth and his hands outstretched toward human sin and misery. He is always to remember that his service is not angelic and

that accordingly neither Gabriel, who was sent to interpret a vision to Daniel, nor Michael one of the chief of the angelic princes, is his chief example.

There is one specious incitement to unmanliness in the pastorate that is worth a special mention. It lies in the temptation to assume among the people the possession of a learning which a man has had neither the industry or the application to secure. This species of unreality is all the more easily detected now, because, whether for good or evil, we have passed beyond a time when certain position, influence and functions were conceded to the ministerial office, as matters of course. A pastor in these days should always remember that the exactions of his vocation forbid that he should become such an expert in every department of knowledge as to warrant oracular and ex-cathedra opinions. Every man who in these days is making full proof of his fidelity and efficiency as a pastor is really expected to do the work of about four men. To study as much as a professor, at least, should study, to make as many calls as a doctor, to do vastly more public speaking and upon a wider range of vastly more important subjects, than a lawyer or politician, and to give as much time and attention to parochial and denominational affairs as the average man gives to business. But notwithstanding all these exactions some pastors are tempted, when among their people, to a kind of affectation of omniscience. To a man of any other vocation his adversary cometh and searcheth him out. But a certain sort of insincerity peculiar to his calling, is not always conducive to the cultivation of the sturdiest form of pastoral manliness and reality. And more than this, if the minister be at all popular, he not infrequently finds himself in a certain atmosphere of adulation, such as depresses real manhood and induces mental softness and flabbiness. It is not unmanly for a minister to be ignorant of many things, but it is unmanly and, what is worse, unethical for any man, who shares in the species of insincerity to which we have above alluded, to make false pretenses to the possession of a knowledge that he does not possess.

This is the plain and unmistakable fact that the reality of the

man in the pastoral functions counts for very much in the exercise of his office. "It I were a better man, I should be a better preacher," once said Mr. Beecher, and every pastor without confessing himself bad could say the same thing. The influence of the sermon is largely a matter of personality. Men do not usually take it at its face value until they have ascertained what kind of a man is backing the sermon up in the pastorate. The sermon may be homiletically correct, doctrinally sound, rhetorically brilliant, oratorically cogent, but it is no more than "sounding brass" unless backed up by an easily discerned reality in the life of the man who has preached it, and should the people find out that the preacher is not himself willing to do what he commends to others, and when they once learn that his pompous unction is several leagues in advance of his ethical standards outside of the pulpit.

2. What we have just said leads us to our second reflection, viz., that the pastor must be a man of exalted ethical ideals and standards.

Out of the pastor's life are the issues of his preaching. To buy your ideal you must pay out yourself. It can be had for no less a price. They are very rare but there are always some orthodox infidels in the pulpit, who can talk glibly enough about faith and atonement and reconciliation, but who sometimes nullify the moral law in speech and practice. Pre eminently God's ministers are the light of the world; but if the light that is in them be darkness, or is obscured by dark deeds that cannot come to the light without reproach to their calling, then the case is bad indeed. God's servants are the salt of the earth, but if the salt have lost its savor it is good for nothing but to be trodden under foot of men. St. Paul fairly, if not effectually, silenced the slanders of many, and greatly confirmed the faith of good men, when he was able to appeal to his own life in vindication of his motives and conduct. He could say with modesty because of its truthfulness, "Ye know that from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons. If a pastor maintain in their integrity lofty ethical ideals then doctrine and



morals, precept and practice, study and pastoral labor, closet and pulpit work, are likely to have something of due proportion. Only conduct is permanently eloquent. Reputation in the pastorate rather than rhetoric in the pulpit makes or mars the sermon. If the people trust their pastor they will hear and heed him though he be not a pulpit star; but if in consequence of discovered delinquencies and commercial lapses from strict obedience to the moral law, their confidence is shaken in him, they are certain to be uninfluenced by what he may say in the most attractive manner of public speech. It is not only important that the preacher preach well on Sunday, but also that the pastor walk circumspectly on Monday.

There is nothing in the vocation of a Christian pastor to render him immune against unworthy practices. Like any other man he has to "fight the good fight of faith" on his own account. Just in proportion as his pulpit renders him conspicuous is it the more incumbent upon him to practice up to his ideals. The doctrines he proclaims he will be careful therefore to make the foundation stones of his own character and the inspiration of his own conduct. Moral standards that he endorses he will scrupulously endeavor to build into the structure of his own life, and he will recommend no system of ethics which he has not subjected to the test of experience and practice. The prophet supplied the force for the law, the dynamic by which it got itself obeyed. As one of them says, his word was "as a hammer" to drive home and fasten in a sure place the nails of the law.

And is not this the function of the Christian Church as a whole, and eminently of its pastors? What are we here for as the leaders and teachers of the Church but to bring the principles of the gospel to bear upon all life? In his dealing with his own people and others it is no small part of the pastor's duty be the voice of a real Christian conscience. It is his business to direct the searchlight on individual sins, to apply the measure of the sanctuary to worldly maxims which his hearers sometimes take for axioms, and to practices which they deem legitimate because they are popular, to witness against

the cancerous vices which are eating out the life of the nation, and to bring national acts to the standard of our Lord's teaching. His testimony will be limping, his protests unavailing, and his remonstrances unheeded, until for himself he shall have accepted and applied the ethical principles of the gospel in his own personal life.

The pastoral ideal is specially liable to be lowered some in a time when the multiform "get-rich-quick" schemes are pressed persistently upon the attention of ministers of the gospel. A preacher known to be a money hunter soon becomes useless in the kingdom of Christ. Christ and mammon are antipodal. The christian conscience recognizes this and the world's instinct somehow comes to look upon it as correct. Accordingly the moment that the world detects a money loving teacher of religion, either with delight—as finding so high an example of its own gross ideals—or scornfully—as seeing the contrast between his office and his disposition, it at once concludes that he has "become even as one of us." The pastor at once steps down from his vantage ground and mingles with the greedy worldlings, to be jostled by them and to lose his power as well as his dignity when he becomes secularized. Called to use his gifts in the service of the Church he should be provided for in his reasonable living, but beyond this he should not be absorbingly interested in monetary matters. If he meddle in mining stocks, petroleum or the stock jobbers shambles, he is certain to defile his office. If the Lord of glory became poor for our sakes, we may be glad to remain poor for the sake of his great work and grace. Better is reliance upon the Lord than upon his own shrewdness in the money markets, where placed at a disadvantage, he is likely to be beaten. The chief design on the part of a true shepherd of men is this, that he may make and bless the seat of all their joy and sorrow, the source of all their ambition and purpose—the soul, and to keep himself in his vocational functions and life "unspotted from the world."

3. Again we may be permitted to say that the model pastor must have at least a fair capacity for leadership in the affairs of the church. The church is divinely appointed as "the pil-

lar and ground of the truth," and as the one central agency by which the world is to be rescued from the power of sin, and yet its forms of action are various and sometimes indirect. This means that the Christian pastor is to be identified as a leader with the various agencies of the Church and in some measure, with those various agencies of benevolence and philanthropy which are without the sphere of the Church. In connection with these latter, however, a word of caution may not be out of place. It is that the pastor should be on his guard against committing himself, or the influence of the Church, to ill-judged or impracticable schemes, under whatever auspices they may be proposed. The present is an age of both real and pretended reforms. There seems to be no end to projects, conventions, and organizations proposed to mitigate evils and to promote good. Some of them may be necessary, and others well meant but some others have not even these recommendations, while others lack so many of the elements that promise even a fair measure of success that they ought not to be encouraged. The direct work of the Church comprehends nearly everything that is good, and is of itself enough to absorb the time and energies of the strongest men, and in consequence, pastors should only assent to render personal or official coöperation to such enterprises of which the good character and practical tendencies are fully established.

In all legitimate lines of ministerial influence, however, this is of fundamental importance in the effective exercise of the functions of his high vocation, that the pastor shall have capacity to direct and lead men. In the past he led more because of his official position in the community. If he leads now-a-days, it must be in consequence of his ability to lead men primarily because of his personal qualities. Priestcraft and a sort of instinctive reverence for it have had their day and are done. The capacity which makes a man an officer in an army, the captain of a ship or the executive head of an industrial enterprise is the kind of capacity it is well for the pastor to have, at least, in a moderate degree. If he have it in no degree at all a profitless ministry most assuredly stares him in the face. The

greater his capacity in this respect, other good and essential factors not being overlooked or minimized, the larger will be his influence.

4. We may note again that in the model pastor there will be found a certain ruggedness of character that will inspire some endurance. Softness of character is a sure forerunner of pastoral failure. The great apostle who expended himself in tireless evangelism exhorts us to "endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." The soldier on a campaign must not be too particular about his personal comfort. He must take cheerfully what comes to him whether it be rough or smooth. He must do his duty both in foul weather and in fair, and press forward on the march whether meadows or rocks or toilsome morass be beneath his feet. The Christian pastor in the oversight of his flock frequently has rough work to do. He has sometimes to encounter rough people, living in rough places and on rough food. If his character be soft he is very likely to think much about this roughness. He is exceedingly anxious to get a more comfortable place where he shall not encounter rough people in rough surroundings. His anxiety about his lodging place and its conveniences out run the cure of souls he is about to undertake. He is greatly afraid of work and discomfort. Things must be made easy for him, for he is of luxurious tastes and not adapted to the strenuous life. He is easily discouraged by bad days, toilsome roads and dirty streets in obscure quarters of the town. He is most at home among flattering ladies, emasculating drawing rooms and with the magazines of the lighter order.

Over the gateway into his kingdom the Lord hath placed these words: "If any man will come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." The pace and spirit of the times render us liable to forget this condition of discipleship sometimes even in the ministry. All men who come under the secret dominion of the Lord are to live in something of self-sacrifice. That man who has not learned the lesson of self-abnegation has no place in a vocation which is to teach men this primary principle of the Kingdom of God.

We are called to serve and not to be served. Our honor, our ease, even our salary is secondary, and our helpfulness first. Burden bearers we are by the very choice of our lot and burden-bearers we must rejoice to be as fellow heirs and co-workers with our Master. The minister who tries to save himself is doomed to failure. We will go even further and say that the pastor who thinks too much about himself, or who keeps his finger always upon his physical or mental pulse, in an attempt at any morbid self-analysis is certain not to get on well. I am fully aware that the demands made upon the nervous energy of the minister are always great, and that a great strain is constantly resting upon his physical powers and upon his sensibilities. But that is no reason why he should always be whining about overwork, and wondering whether he can do this or go there, and saying to himself in a half congratulatory way and to others, in wearisome repetitiousness, that he is so "tired."

Said a bright hostess who dwelt in a home where ministers were frequently guests: "Some ministers are such chronically tired people that they really become tiresome." She was a woman of discernment, and in some pastoral instances we have known, there was some justification for her reflection. People soon lose patience and respect for the minister who is always sparing himself or who is chronically "tired." Every good and true minister is a hard worker, but that they work harder and wear out faster than other diligent men, may be seriously doubted. Accordingly the minister who is always lugubriously pitying himself and courting the pity of other sentimental people, is not likely to be successful in any large sense. On the other hand the man who throws himself energetically into his work, who proposes to spend his energy and dedicate his powers to the cause of Christ; who is not always worrying about doing too much, but seeks by God's help to meet every demand that may be reasonably made upon his time and strength, is bound to succeed and will be sought by people who need help and comfort, and they will in turn accord him their love and trust.

The minister ought to be the chief authority in his pastorate concerning Christianity; the chief man as to its experience knowing its very depths, he ought to know it as a strong working power that has created for itself a great organization called the Church, which is exerting a momentous influence on the world around it; an authority also as to the history of Christianity, a sphere in which some of the hardest problems must be encountered. All these he should be, and more, but in, with and under all, he should be known as a model also of systematic industry and application in the one thing unto which he hath been called and set apart, viz., the work of the Kingdom of God on this earth.

5. It is worth remarking and with emphasis, that the pastor, who contemplates making of himself a model, must be a man of good manners.

The man who thinks that he can become big enough and learned enough to live in defiance of the canons of good society, we do not mean artificial society, had better not enter the ministry. Manners is a social word. If man were not a social being he would have no need for such a word in the dictionary. He would then have a manner of life but not manners, for association with others, he is compelled to adopt conventionalities which modify his liberty perhaps for no higher reason sometimes than the whims and prejudices of other people among whom he is compelled to live. For the most part manners constitute a sort of unwritten code by which we attempt to keep from giving needless offence. They are the result of ages of courtesy; they are the embodiment of gentlemanliness; they make a sort of way by which society seeks to protect itself from the offensive. I know that manners may be only a kind of outside veneer without any real courtesy or gentlemanliness within. The manners of a Chesterfield may be but a species of sheep's clothing covering up a real wolf, the garniture of the whited-sepulchre concealing a bogus and hideous interior.

Manners may be like that wonderful smile of the cat, described in one of the popular stories, which still remained long

after the cat had disappeared. They may degenerate into mere forms of courtesy and like all forms may lose their vitality. Sometimes they may even run to seed, as is the case in ultra fashionable society. But the simpering externalism of alleged high society, is not the only kind of manner worth mentioning, and the ball room model is not the only standard of excellence. Instead of expressing a real courtesy within, some forms of manners result only from posing before mirror and consulting the tailor.

But reality stands behind good manners of the genuine order. Boorishness implies a lack of fine perception if not a lack of heart. In the end what we are will make itself felt, but first we are judged by what we appear to be. Manners never make a gentleman, but enable a gentleman to express that which is within him. They manifest the way that the gentleman generally acts, disarm prejudice and make it easier for the man to show what he in reality is. Manners are societies laws and society dislikes an anarchist in the parlor and the sick chamber and in the administration of the sacred functions of a religious teacher, as well as the bomb-thrower in the hay market.

One of the most bright and useful preachers of this country has made this sagacious reflection about some pastoral delinquencies. "Soiled linen, unbrushed clothing, muddy boots, teeth which have been left to their own destruction, finger nails dressed in deep black, mourning the loss of all things, a general unkempt, slack appearance, is sufficient evidence in some cases to demonstrate that the possessor has mistaken his calling." And speaking of the tobacco habit, he says further, that, "the distinguished divines curling smoke and great thoughts, amid the fragrant Havana are quite unanimous in their paternal counsels to the young to avoid their peccadillos."

All this being true, certainly the Christian pastor, of all men, needs to look well to his manners. He should always live and act in the reverent consciousness of the fact that he represents the first gentleman in the world. He cannot be too particular as to his habits, his person and the whole atmosphere that he



creates. It is a slur on the Master when his ambassadors are slothful, untidy or careless of those decencies which are demanded by etiquette and the evasion of which is far more due to slouchiness than to godliness. There should be a certain pride and nicety amongst those who stand for the Church as invariably obtains in what is called "good society." And all this is quite compatible with perfect inward humility and genuineness. The pastor is entrusted with a message and he cannot afford by unpleasing action or boorishness of manner to arouse opposition or even to direct attention from his great theme. There may be higher laws which will compel disregard of the lower, but we need always to be sure that there is a principle involved. The man in the pastorate however unconventional he may be in presenting truth needs to be conventional in demeanor, lest he direct attention from his message. Good conduct really makes him inconspicuous. The innate slovenliness of some men has been known to manifest itself in what ought to be the most beautiful, solemn and impressive service of the sanctuary, the administration of the holy communion. It is unhappily true that its administration is not always as impressive as it ought to be because of the meager conception of its meaning. But our interest here is with some incongruities connected with its administration. Both pastor and people should come to this holy service with becoming preparation and it may not be amiss to add that the pastor should come in becoming cleanliness.

Charles G. Finney used to bluntly tell his students never to administer a sacrament with dirty finger nails. When asked whether he thought the advice strictly necessary, that sturdy Paritan saint replied that there were men and even good men who unless reminded of that simple duty in the bluntest possible fashion would actually commit such careless sacrilege.

Even as to dress there is such a thing as good manners. True it is that a pastor's work is primary and his appearance secondary. An over-scrupulous attention to details of dress rightly conveys the impression that it occupies too large a share of his thought. When Oliver Goldsmith appeared for ordina-

tion in a pair of flaming red trousers, he was rejected without examination. "If you would save souls," said Mr. Spurgeon to his students, "you must come from the closet and not from the bandbox." The robe of righteousness must not be laid aside and the place of the garment of praise usurped by the latest fashions of the French or English court. Nevertheless the minister should dress properly. When God clothed the lilies of the field, he arrayed them in a glory greater than that of Solomon. Aarons sons were commanded to wear girdles made by the embroiderer and headdress, as the Scripture says, "for glory and for beauty." A pastor should dress as well as he can. Carelessness in dress is no indication of humility, and slovenliness may cover a large amount of pride and arrogance. Mr. Beecher once said that if he were going to be proud of his clothes at all, he should much prefer that they be good ones, for then he would have more to be proud of. Shabbiness and uncleanness are not to be taken as the signs of abounding grace. A faithful pastor is, in the good sense of the term, intensely a society man. Much of his time is taken in associating with people. He meets all grades of them, and good manners make him at home among them all. Obsequiousness in a home of refinement is in bad taste and produces contempt, and lack of courtesy in other homes is an impertinence. Condescension, paternal airs, assumptions of superiority when in the presence of the poor, studied dignity and pomposity, are all unmannerly and doubtless an abomination before the Lord. The man of real manners and true pastoral courtesy has not different codes for different classes, but his standpoint is this, "all ye are brethren."

Thus as a good man and as a gentleman the pastor moves among his people and binds them to him with the strong cords of christian affection and genuine respect. In Knowles recently published story known as *St. Cuthberts* there is a striking portrayal of what it all comes to. The big hearted pastor, who knew the utility of the special cure of souls, says: "As the minister of a vast congregation like *St. Cuthberts*, I might have requested an assistant who should relieve me of the visit-

ing, leaving me only the duties of the pulpit, oceanic enough for any man. Indeed one of the stalwarts had suggested this to me, averring that I needed more time for my sermons whereat I looked at him sharply; but his face was placid as a sea of milk, which is the way of Scotsmen when they mean to score. But this dual ministry was ever the object of my disfavor, for he preaches best who visits best, and the weekly garner makes the richest grist for the Sunday mill. True and tender visiting is the sermons fuse, and what God hath put together no man can safely put asunder."

6. It is worth saying, in our day especially, that the model pastor will have the patience and hopefulness, to deal with men one by one in the cure of souls. This is not the characteristic method of the times. Much of Christian work in our day has lost sight of the idea of one man who is a Christian winning spiritual mastery over another man who is not a Christian. One reason no doubt why so little is accomplished is because so many good people have an ambition to do so much. While they are engaged in formulating plans and raising funds to convert a whole center of population, the one man who might have been saved by some other man going after him, as Andrew went after his brother Simon, dies without hope, and soon the elaborate plans all go the same way. A great deal of arithmetic has got into our evangelical estimates. The statistic habit has become epidemic. Matthew Arnold declares that "we worship the book of Numbers." The tendency to estimate success by numbers once led King David astray, and it sometimes has done the same thing with the earnest heart of some diligent and faithful pastor.

Success in our day has somehow come to mean, in the popular estimate, large figures. In business it is the largest number of dollars, in college the largest number of students, in newspapers the largest number of subscribers and advertisers, and in books the largest number of editions. It is not at all a matter of surprise that pastors should become infected with the mania of the day, and come to look upon the Church as something the success of which is estimated by the size of the

roll-call and the muster of simultaneous additions. Such an estimate of parochial success, we may be permitted to say, pulls down the spiritual life of any pastor and materializes it. We shall some day no doubt be forced back into a truer estimate of the fact that pains taken to permanently benefit one man in the aggregate and the long run, come to more than temporarily collecting a great crowd. The man who has the patience and hopefulness to persistently engage in that kind of work, unostentatious and unheralded though it be, is doing a larger work than the man who surrounds himself for a few weeks with a multitude and then goes his way. It is the quieter and less spectacular of the two methods that is nourishing "the remnant" whereby the earth shall be redeemed.

Before a body of ministers not long ago the Rev. Dr. Erdman, the recently elected Professor of Practical Theology in Princeton Seminary, in discussing this phase of our subject, brought to view the much neglected method of our Lord and His Apostles, that of personal contact with individual souls in order to effect their redemption. "Mass meetings may save souls," he said, "but there is a better method of accomplishing that end, and that is one man after one man. It is easy to preach to a vast assemblage; it is far more difficult and more effective to sit down and tell one man that he is lost unless he accepts Jesus Christ. This is the true evangelism."

The faithful pastor who is content to keep on at this sort of personal cure of souls, in humble dependence upon Him "who, when and where it pleases God, works faith in those who hear the gospel," shall not labor in vain or go unrewarded. If his successes go unheralded and men fail to assure him of the good he is doing, let him not be faithless or unbelieving. It may be that he is entitled to the full advantage of the known and unknown results of his ministry. Where there are known results, where his successes are heralded and lauded of men, if they be genuine, he can be assured not only with the probability but with the certainty that the unknown and unannounced results of his work exceed even the known. Canon Twells, in one of his colloquies on preaching, introduces his readers to a

conversation between a rector and a vicar on results in preaching, which may serve as an indication as to what any faithful and true witness in the ministry may believe of himself and his work. At one point the rector falls into a desponding mood, like Bunyan's Christian, and the vicar plays the part of Bunyan's Hopeful. The colloquy closes with this incident, told by the vicar: "A friend of mine, a layman, was once in the company of a very eminent preacher, then in the decline of life. My friend happened to remark what a comfort it must be to think of all the good he had done by his gift of eloquence. The eyes of the old man filled with tears. 'You little know, you little know. If I ever turned one heart from the ways of disobedience to the wisdom of the Just, God has withheld the assurance from me. I have been admired and flattered and run after, but how gladly I would forget all that, to be told of one single soul I have been instrumental in saving!' The eminent preacher entered into his rest. There was a great funeral. Many passed round the grave who had often times hung entranced upon his lips. My friend was there and by his side was a stranger, who was so deeply moved that when all was over my friend said to him: 'You knew him, I suppose?' 'Knew him,' was the reply, 'no, I never spoke to him, but I owe to him my soul.'"

The pastor who goes after men in this quiet and unnoted way, can always rest upon this assurance, that he is joining forces with the Almighty, and that even though his feet may never tread among the standing corn, and even though the reapers may go to and fro over his grave to gather the fruitage of that pastor's sowing, nevertheless he too shall join in the reaping. The whole matter is expressed and illustrated in one of the passages of the history of Isaiah. God revealed Himself to that prophet in a vision. He saw the Lord sitting on a throne, and heard the seraphim crying: "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of hosts." He saw the portals of the door move at the voice of him that cried, and before the great glory revealed he felt himself undone and of unclean lips. Then God touched his lips with a coal from the altar and purified and consecrated

him to bear His message to men. He told the prophet that the people would not hear nor understand him, that he should preach to dull ears and hard hearts. Nevertheless he was to preach, and in due time the results of his fidelity as the Lord's prophet would be manifest. A long interval stretched between the preaching and those results, an interval filled with wasted cities, desolated lands and houses without men, but at last the word of the Lord bore fruit in the repentance and submission of the people. The prophet delivered his message and drew his inspiration from God and found his joy in the divine and unfailling assurances of success in God's own time.

The pastorate that never startles, never dazzles, that cuts but a small figure in the newspapers, but that year by year remains steadfast, and that diligently look after all classes, after the child and the man, the rich and the poor, the joyful and the sorrowing, those in prosperity and those in adversity, that kind of a pastorate certainly has its own blessed mission among men and always shall have.

Such, in some only of its manifold aspects, is the pastoral office, the cure of souls, a benign and gracious vocation, all right-minded people must acknowledge, whether it be looked at from the side of the pastor or that of the people. To the man who has in him the true conception of what this calling means in the amplitude of its functions and influences, any flock that may in the Providence of God be assigned to him, is, what one who knew its particular joys called "his own beautiful flock." It is beautiful for the simple reason that it is a flock, and that in a particular sense it is his flock; a group of people, a company of men, women and children, an actual family of human souls to care for, to look after, to counsel, to pray for, to help in times of trouble, to guide in perplexities, to console in sorrow, to cheer with hope and to incite to charity.

The man who joins forces with the Head of the Church in doing that work can always fall back on the assurance that the world needs his peculiar kind of work, that it cannot prosper without that work and that left undone the world is bound to suffer. The man who does that work, putting into it all the

possibilities of goodness and efficiency that are in him may always comfort himself also with this additional assurance that he is bringing nearer the day when mankind shall become the one flock of the one shepherd even of the "chief shepherd and bishop of souls." But while such views are sufficient to show the superiority of the pastoral vocation to all others, and that its present rewards are not of any inferior order, nevertheless the chief rewards of the faithful under shepherd lie beyond this present life. In that certainty he may always find encouragements to quicken his faith, and joys to over-balance his sorrows, even though it will only be when the Chief Shepherd shall appear as the Judge of the quick and the dead that he "shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." Then "they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

In the contemplation of this high hope and this glad anticipation, we who are called and chosen of the Lord in this high vocation may lift our hearts toward our Lord and say:

"O master let me walk with thee  
In lowly paths of service free;  
Tell me thy secret; help me bear  
The strain of toil, the fret of care.  
  
Help me the slow of heart to move  
By some clear winning word of love;  
Teach me the wayward feet to stay,  
And guide them in the homeward way.  
  
Teach me thy patience; still with thee  
In closer, dearer company,  
In work that keeps faith strong and sweet  
In trust that triumphs over wrong.  
  
In hope that sends a shining ray  
Far down the future's broadening way;  
In peace that only thou canst give,  
With thee, O master let me live."



## ARTICLE V.

## A ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW OF LUTHER.

BY PROFESSOR KARL JOSEF GRIMM, PH.D.

## II.

We have seen the picture of Luther and Lutheranism as presented by Father Denifle.\* No doubt many will have called out in amazement: "How is it possible to view the Reformer and his work in such a light?" Does not such a presentation contradict all the laws of historical probability? Can he whose influence reached over millions of men and for whose teaching many gave up their lives have been in reality a corrupt carnal man, a liar and deceiver? How can a moral monster succeed in drawing unto him a whole nation? Of course there were those for whom his gospel of Christian liberty meant a permit for license. He says himself: † *video monachos nostros multos exire nulla causa alia quam qua intraverant, hoc est ventris et libertatis carnalis gratia*. But what of those who, like Durer, openly confessed how the preaching of Luther had raised them out of dire moral distress and had given them strength to enter upon a new life? Were such men totally blind? Are they not fruits of Luther's gospel which can be appealed to when application is to be made of the principle of Jesus: "By their fruits ye shall know them?"

But Denifle claims that his exposition is strictly true, being based on the sources. Let us see then what are the presuppositions which he brings to his task, and the methods through which he obtains his results.

Does Denifle approach his subject with the calm mind of the historian? This question, it appears, can only be answered in the negative. It is not so much the unbiased investigator that pronounces those severe judgments; it is rather the scholastic theologian and the zealous defender of the faith.

\* *The Lutheran Quarterly* XXXVI. 2, pp. 236 ff. I am indebted for Pt. II to Kaweran, Köhler, Kolde, Haussleiter, Hausrath.

† *Enders*, III, 323.

Now a just evaluation of the work of Luther seems if not an impossible, at least a most difficult task for a staunch upholder of the Papal Church. Many judgments from the Roman side about the Reformation make it plain that the sentence is already sure before the case is properly presented. The verdict is pronounced by the authority of Rome, and subsequent investigation seems intended only to confirm it. Whoever denies the authority of the Church and her teaching is a heretic, a rebel against the unity of the Church and against Christ. He who is against Christ is Antichrist. He who falls away from Rome, the center of the Church, has long before abandoned all care for salvation and becomes completely absorbed in scientific and other worldly pursuits, neglecting prayer, meditation and the means of grace. Thus without stay and support, sin has obtained mastery over him, and he becomes an instrument of Satan. This is the schema of an apostate and heretic. Now Protestantism is heresy, and Luther is heresiarch. His life and development, his teaching and work must, therefore, fit into the schema.

It is with such presuppositions that Denifle approaches his task. He comes forward as a representative of "Roman Catholic science," as *defensor fidei*. It can scarcely be expected that the brave defender of papism should judge calmly of its indefatigable and successful opponent. Denifle's conclusions are not the outcome and result of an unbiased investigation of the sources, but the sources are appealed to, to furnish the proofs for the truth of the prejudgment of the Church. And his art of interpretation in connection with his scholarship succeeds in proving the case. Luther, the Augustinian friar, broke his vows and turned heresiarch. How was he led into this dire condition? He yielded to the desires of the flesh. The desire to follow carnal lust was the main-spring of his actions and teachings. This was coupled with pride. Once in the meshes of the flesh he became blind and did not shrink from using any means whatsoever to defend his position.

Denifle begins his criticism with Luther's relation to the institutions of his Order, more especially to the monastic vows. It is but natural that this point should be in the foreground for

Denifle the zealous monk. He endeavors to show that all that Luther wrote on the subject is nothing but a pack of lies, falsifications, distortions, foolish remarks, etc. The method employed by the learned Dominican is that of Luther's contemporary opponents from the mendicant orders. Both the manner of writing and looking at things is the same. Denifle is very proud of his method, the "aristotelian-scholastic" method applied to history. He finds in it an infallible means to prove the correctness of a premise or principle assumed. One of its characteristics is a delight in details which are collected, used and grouped in accordance with a definite purpose. Denifle tears the whole in pieces, takes out what appears to substantiate his presupposition, and proclaims the fragments to be the essence of the whole.

It is but to be expected that Denifle working with such presuppositions and such a method should see things in a wrong light. The reproach which he casts into the teeth of Luther and Protestant scholars may be hurled against him; he misquotes, detaching passages from their context and mutilating them; he misinterprets them and then draws misleading and damaging conclusions "with iron consistency".

In 1534 Luther wrote to a friend: "The highest art of my opponents now is to wrest from my books such passages which may be tortured to my disadvantage, so as to obscure and hide that which stands in close connection speaking to my advantage.\* This is also Denifle's art. What suits is taken out and only as far as it suits. What follows, perhaps in the next line or on the following page putting it into its proper light and perspective is overlooked. A striking application of this method we can see in the paragraph with the heading: LUTHER WISHES TO BE A HOG, THE IDEAL OF A BLESSED LIFE. We read:

In the year 1543, three years before his death, after he had been near death as early as 1527 and 1537, and had had a foretaste of it, he writes of his experience in the terrors of death: "I know that he who ever felt the terrors or the load of death would prefer to be a hog rather than endure them forever. For a hog lies in its soft down-featherbed in the street or upon the dunghill, rests securely, snorts

\* Erl. 31. 379.

gently, sleeps sweetly, fears neither king nor lord, neither death nor hell, neither the devil nor the wrath of God, lives so altogether free from care as not even to think where the bran is. And were the emperor of Turkey with all his power and wrath coming along, the proud hog would not move a bristle for his sake. If it were stirred up, it would grunt, and if able to speak would say: Behold how you rage, you fool. You have not the tenth part of the pleasant life I have. You do not live for one hour as securely, gently and quietly as I live always, even if you were ten times as rich and great. *Summa*: the hog does not think of death, is altogether secure, leading a calm life. If the butcher comes to kill the hog, it thinks perhaps of a pinching piece of wood or stone, and does not become aware of death till the last moment, but looks forward to an everlasting life. No king, nor the messiah of the Jews (*i. e.* the one whom they are still waiting for) will excel the hog herein, nor any man, however wise, great, rich, holy, or powerful he may be." And why? "The hog did not eat from the apple which taught us wretched men, in paradise, the difference between good and evil." What an awful cynicism is not contained in these words! And yet at the same time what an irony! The very man who invented the doctrine of the Christian's certitude of salvation annihilated and altogether destroyed it. Just when it was to fulfill its purpose it forsook him, and he experienced something quite differently, namely the terrors of death, and in such measure that he would rather be a hog than endure them continually.

And now we turn to Luther and read the passage in the context. We find the words in a polemic against the Jews and their lies.\* Luther combats the unbelief of the Jews, their false hope of the messiah. If God would give me no other than the earthly lord expected by the rabbis, I would rather be a hog than a man. Of what avail were all the power and splendor, the riches and pleasures of the Messiah when I have to fear death, hell and the wrath of God. Would this not be the happiness of the tyrant Dionysius? It would be far better to be a living hog than a man dying an everlasting death. "*What is the messiah of the Jews to me if he cannot help me, poor man against this awful disaster, if he cannot make my life the tenth part as joyful as that of the hog? But if I had a messiah who were able to save me from this calamity so that I would not need to be afraid of death and would be ever sure of life and could defy devil and hell and would not have to tremble before God's wrath, my heart would leap for joy and would be*

\* Erl. 32. 261 ff.

intoxicated with delight; the fire of the love to God would be kindled, praises and thanksgivings would never cease. WE CHRISTIANS HAVE SUCH A MESSIAH, and thank God, the Father of all mercies, with all our hearts; we gladly forget all sufferings and harm which the devil inflicted upon us in paradise. YES, WE HAVE SUCH A MESSIAH who speaks to us, John XI, 28: *I am the resurrection and the life, etc.*, and John VIII, 51: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, he who keeps my commandments will never see death. Jews and Turks care nothing for such a messiah.*"

Instead of cynicism and irony Luther's words are clearly the expression of a faith which conquers death through Christ.

An expression receives its true meaning and proper value only from the context and the circumstances which have led to it. Moreover official documents and chance expressions in familiar letters must not be treated alike. We must also take into consideration the reasons and presuppositions that may have induced a man to express himself in a certain manner and to give his thought, now this direction, now another. We must examine whether an utterance is intended to be serious or a jest or irony; whether the expression was uttered in a cheerful, normal mood or in melancholy and despondency. Denifle apparently makes no distinction between his source-material. A quotation is a quotation and has the same value be it taken from a sermon, from a didactic work, an official document, from a polemic writing, or from a letter; or be it a word passed at table and in familiar conversation.

Quotations may be heaped upon quotations, and yet the truth may be missed. The Erlangen theologian J. Chr. K. v. Hofman \* has shown how a repulsive picture of St. Paul may be produced on the basis of quotations taken at random from his epistles. Paul de Lagarde † has pointed out how a bio-

\* *Paulus, eine Diellingersche Skizze.*

† *Deutsche Schriften*, 3d ed., Göttingen, 1892, p. 404. In this respect a very instructive compilation of data concerning the life and personality of Kant appeared in the *New Church Review* of January, 1901, (quoted in *Kant's Prolegomena*, ed. by Dr. Paul Carus, Chicago, 1902, p. 283 f.): "In all his metaphysical work Kant was not pursuing a religious course and was in fact becoming less and less of a Christian. He

graphy may be written where every individual statement is true and yet the whole an immense falsehood.

Denifle views Luther in his relation to the contemporary and preceding theology. He examines him on his knowledge in patristics, scholasticism and mysticism and finds that the Reformer is not only an ignoramus but also a falsifier. Luther misquotes and misinterprets his sources; he draws conclusions that are not at all in the premises and builds his systems thereon. Now all this may be true, and, as was known before Denifle, to some extent is true. But does it follow that Luther is on this account a falsifier? Denifle misquotes and misinterprets Luther and then bases on such misquotations and misinterpretations his judgment of the abominable char-

---

was however, no more contracted in his philosophical view of the limits of reason than he was in all the ways of his life." "His body was extremely emaciated, and at last it was dried like a potsherd," said one who knew him well. He was hollow-chested, and one shoulder was too low. Not five feet high, his bones were small and weak, and his muscles still weaker (Stuckenburger, p. 93.) He had strong prejudice against the Jews (*ibid.*, p. 116.) He took no interest in other philosophers (*ibid.*, p. 124.) Though he wrote much in the field of theology, he knew almost nothing of theologians (*ibid.*, p. 359.) He did not answer letters (*ibid.*, p. 127.) Held to his views after rebutting facts were shown him, and would contradict foreigners who spoke of their own countries in a manner to interfere with his preconceived ideas (*ibid.*, p. 141.) He lived in the same small city with his two sisters, yet did not speak to them for twenty-five years because of their inferior position (*ibid.*, p. 182.) He spoke contemptuously of women and was especially hostile to those of any mental power (*ibid.*, p. 184.) One of his jokes was that there can be no women in heaven, for it is written that there was silence there for the space of half an hour (*ibid.*, p. 187.) and this from a man who always did the talking wherever he was and who listened to another with marked impatience (*ibid.*, p. 141.) He did not desire friendships, for it is a great burden to be tied to the fate of others and to be loaded with their "deeds," (*ibid.*, p. 193.) He said that he did not know the meaning of the word "spirit" (*ibid.*, p. 240.) With Hume he held that we have no knowledge of God (*ibid.*, p. 290.) He saw no use in revelation (*ibid.*, p. 335.) He identified religion with mere morality (*ibid.*, p. 338.) He never attended church and spoke of prayer as ridiculous (*ibid.*, p. 354.) His views against religion led his students to become mockers (*ibid.*, p. 358.) His old age was unhappy (*ibid.*, p. 425.) and his rigidity of habits became repulsive in the last degree (*ibid.*, p. 435.) He died February 12, 1804, after fifteen years of mental decline.

acter of Luther's life and teaching. Shall we say that Denifle is a falsifier? What constitutes falsification? The conscious intention to deceive. But this was far from Luther. His misquotations can be explained without having recurrence to such a preposterous charge. Luther wrote his work *De votis monasticis indicium* on the Wartburg without the help of library. He had, therefore, to rely altogether on his recollection of former readings. Is it not remarkable that it never for a moment occurs to Denifle, who devotes several hundred pages to a criticism of the work, to take this fact into account? Luther often quotes from memory. In the pressure of work he could not always find time to turn to books and manuscripts so as to verify reminiscences, allusions, references, quotations, and we are surprised that misquotations are not of more frequent occurrence. How many falsifiers would there be today if we would judge according to Denifle's fashion.

As to Luther's misinterpretation of the sources it must not be lost out of sight that he was a child of his time. There was scarcely a beginning of a historical interpretation. The Bible, the Fathers, the Doctors of the Church, were studied with a view of offering proof-texts for dogmatics. Every medieval book furnishes us with examples how the most incredible sense could be extracted from the simplest words. We shall not charge on that account the medieval writers with falsification. The art of historical interpretation is an acquisition of quite recent times. Luther read his sources with an eye to find proofs for *his* teaching, for the teaching of the apostle Paul. And here his opponents, on account of the historic continuity with the immediate past which they represented, were sometimes better able to interpret the sense of the medieval writers and the Fathers than Luther who read and interpreted them from the standpoint of the Pauline gospel. But if his opponents sometimes prove his superiors in the proper understanding of patristic and scholastic teaching he is their master of the interpretation of the word of the Bible, especially of St. Paul.

Luther did not break all at once with Medieval theology. He tried to hold fast to it as long as he could. He longed to



find a drop of Paulinism in the Middle ages, and rejoiced when he found it, e. g. in Huss. It showed to him that he was not an innovator and revolutionary. His conservatism brought him to see more of it in his sources than is really there. Thus we can explain how he could see in the chance expression *perdite vixi* found in a work written by St. Bernard to glorify monasticism, a proclamation of the righteousness through faith and a condemnation of the monastic life. He could not conceive that this Saint should have thought in a manner altogether unevangelical. It is the same with St. Augustine and others; only with difficulty does Luther cut himself loose from them.

Luther was a bitter foe of scholasticism. It was the ruling theology of the time, the theology in which he himself had been educated. He saw in it the arch-enemy of the sound gospel. Every new theology will always find the ruling theology to be its deadly foe.

But did not Luther totally misrepresent the teaching of the Church? Did he not condemn everything in the lump? Now it may be true that Luther's judgments are onesided, absolute, not relative. But, it may be urged, are not one-sidedness and exclusiveness means of human progress? The rulers in the realm of history are all absolute in their proclamations and criticisms. To remain in the field of religion, turn to the Old Testament Prophets, to Jesus, to Paul, to St. Francis of Assisi. Genius is concerned with the question of principles. And so was Luther. He worked with the sharp Either-Or: the Gospel or the Work of Satan. When in his review of Catholicism he came across teachings and practices that appeared to him as the work of Satan, his words came down like the strokes of a hammer; but how different did he speak, how gentle, how naive his words, when he found the least trace of what appeared to him as the Gospel!

Now if this be so a just criticism will have to ask the question: Did Luther judge wrongly in principle? Did he apply his standard wrongly to the essence of Roman Catholicism? Or is perhaps the standard itself wrong? Perhaps what Luther holds to be the Gospel is not the Gospel? These questions,

while not altogether absent from the work of Denifle, are lost in the maize of details. Criticism of details; no matter how correct it may be, is not here the essential thing. Everything depends on those questions of principle.

Denifle makes a great deal of the contradictions in Luther's character and writings. But Luther might reply with the Hutton of Conrad Ferdinand Meyer:

*Ich bin Kein ausgeklugell Buch.*

*Ich bin ein Mensch mit seinem Widerspruch.*

Luther was not a manual of scholastic philosophy, he was a man. And a strong and unselfish man, who never desired anything for himself. The manner of his polemics did not proceed out of pure arrogance. He knew that gentle warnings were mere compliments in the ears of the "pontifices." He knew in what tone he had to speak to arouse his Germans from the stupid worship of and drowsy devotion to the power of Rome.

If we are to follow the method of Denifle we can equally show that the Bible is an immoral book and that the Prophets, Shakespeare, Schiller, and Goethe were dirty souls. Luther, moreover, cannot be separated from his time. We must not compare his writings with the polite authors of modern times; we must compare them with the writings of a Geiler, a Murner, a Rabelais.

Protestantism seeks after truth, also in the field of history. It cannot remain satisfied with legend and mere tradition. It goes without saying that this applies also to Luther and the Reformation. Any elucidation or rectification must be welcome. If the work of Denifle contains contributions to a better understanding of that important period we acknowledge them with gratitude. But we cannot admit the implicit claim that he, or a Roman Catholic theologian as learned as he, alone is capable of a right understanding and proper valuation of Luther and his work. Perhaps we are also to draw our views concerning Jesus and prohibitive Christianity from the rabbis alone? As a matter of fact Denifle is unable to enter into the real sense of Luther's religion, and it is due to this reason that he cannot follow his deduction.

Denifle asserts that Luther was a corrupt monk who had several times succumbed to his carnal desires, etc., and that this sad condition of his soul was the source and center of his theology. Now Denifle himself shows, in the quotations which he furnishes from Luther's lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, that Luther's decided leaning toward the proposition that concupiscence is irresistible, falls into the time of those lectures (betw. April 1515 to September or October 1516.) In his lectures on the Psalms Luther had, here and there, given expression to the thought that man is by nature infected with evil, sinful lust, and devoid of true faith in God. He was now confirmed by the text of the apostle Paul. At the same time the thought lost its terrors through the increasing clearness of the knowledge and experience of the fundamental significance of the mediatorship of Christ. Luther's piety and faith thus stand under the determining influence of Paulinism; they are oriented altogether differently from medieval piety.

The picture of the Reformer and his work presented by Denifle agrees in essential parts with that of the young Döllinger.\* It will be interesting to hear the judgment which Döllinger pronounced thirty years later (1872) after a more thorough and impartial study of the sources. "It was Luther's overpowering greatness of mind and marvelous many-sidedness which made him to be the man of his time and of his people; and it is correct to say that there has never been a German who has so intuitively understood his people, and in turn has been by the nation so perfectly comprehended, I might say, absorbed by it, as this Augustinian monk at Wittenberg. Heart and mind of the Germans were in his hand like the lyre in the hand of the musician. Moreover, he has given to his people more than any other man in Christian ages has ever given to a people: language, manual for popular instruction, Bible, hymns of worship; and everything which his opponents in their turn had to offer or to place in comparison with these, showed itself tame and powerless and colorless by the side of his sweeping eloquence. They stammered; he

\* *Die Reformation*, 3 vol., Regensburg, 1846-1848; *Luther, Eine Skizze*, Regensburg, 1851.

spoke with the tongue of an orator; it is he only who has stamped the imperishable zeal of his own soul, alike upon the German language and upon the German mind; and even those Germans who abhorred him as the powerful heretic and seducer of the nation, cannot escape, they must discourse with his words, they must think with his thoughts."

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The deeper meaning of the Sunday-school is receiving more consideration today than formerly. The outward expression of this awakened interest is seen in the constantly improving rooms and buildings dedicated to its use. There was a time when anything was good enough for the Sunday-school. Now nothing is too good for it. The outward conditions have outstripped its real inner growth. We have been somewhat like a fond ignorant mother who expresses her love for her daughter in the expensive apparel that adorns her. We are coming, however, to recognize more and more clearly that the Sunday-school ought to be a link in the training of the child, that it supplies a part of its education.

The importance of the Sunday-school in America arises largely from the fact that public education has become secularized. We do not deny that many teachers in the public schools exert a happy and beneficent influence on the child. Yet specific religious instruction is impossible in these schools supported and controlled by a State which is completely divorced from the Church. Protestantism and Democracy form a combination which excludes anything like distinct teaching of religion. In Germany, under a strong central government and with little sectarian spirit, the child receives from four to five hours training a week in the Bible, the Catechism, Church History and the like, for eight years. The teacher is a man of thorough education and is supposed to be devout. The

pastor of the parish has free access to these schools and examines the children.

The American school, however, excludes all this. To make up for its lack is a great problem, which the Sunday-school is expected to solve in part. The Catholic Church, through its parochial schools, endeavors to give its children what they believe the public school does not offer. There is some justification for its existence, in spite of our American repugnance to it. Among Protestants, the parochial school does not seem to be feasible. At all events it does not exist to a large extent.

Protestants fall back upon the Sunday-school to take up and supplement the work of the day-school by educating the religious nature of the child, without which training, education is incomplete. Were this the entire task of the Sunday-school the problem could be easier of solution. But the burden laid upon it is still greater. It is expected not only to supplement the teaching of the secular school, but also to supply the training which ought to be given in the home. The true teacher of the child is the parent. If he be godly and intelligent, the child comes to the Sunday-school with a heart and mind open to the teacher. But when the child comes from the homes of the indifferent the ungodly the modicum of instruction possible in the Sunday-school is utterly inadequate to meet the case even under the most favorable conditions. When the conditions of the school are seriously defective the child gets very little.

The importance of the Sunday-school arises, then, from its professed mission as a training school in religion. Its aim, where properly understood, is to teach the Bible, not simply for the purpose of making it known, but especially in order to awaken the soul to a consciousness of its nature, and needs, and to show it the Way, the Truth and the Life. Its aim is to build a strong, symmetrical Christian character.

The prime factor in the great work of the Sunday-school is the teacher. Let us remember that just as really as the teacher makes the public-school, the college, and the Seminary, so he makes the Sunday-school. I had almost said the teacher is everything. Yes, the true teacher is nearly every-

thing. Equip the Sunday-school with the right kind of teachers and they will solve every problem, because they will realize the needs and apply the remedies. "The Sunday-school Teacher" is the theme of this brief paper.

#### I. NOTICE FIRST THE TEACHER AS HE IS.

I do not wish to underestimate him or her. He is as good probably as the circumstances justify. He has come to his work, in most cases, without much preparation. He has taken up often a task which others refused. He has exercised self-denial in losing rest, in spending money, and in doing work for which he felt himself unfitted. He has stood by his pastor and his church with commendable fidelity. Where natural ability was united with love and experience he became a true teacher in spite of hindrances. The children love him and will arise after a while and call him blessed.

But the true teacher is not the rule, rather the exception. Test him by actual results, for there is no teaching where there is no learning. Visit many a Sunday-school and listen to the teaching, if such it may be called. The score of yesterday's game, the latest style, or perchance some local scandal will be found to be the theme of the teacher, who vainly tries to interest a class whose attention he has not won to higher themes, because he does not know how to do it. Perhaps the teacher is too devout to introduce incongruous matters, but not knowing facts or methods he wearies his class with platitudes and preaching.

I am sure that every pastor and capable superintendent deplores the paucity of good teachers; yea, the teachers themselves are generally most modest in their estimates of themselves. They teach because they are solicited and because there does not seem to be any one who can do better. The pastor is often in despair when he discovers how little the children know of the Bible and the Kingdom.

#### II. THE REMEDY MUST BEGIN WITH THE PASTOR.

The Sunday-school will never become what it ought to be until the pastors take a more profound interest in it. Many of them have long since recognized its importance. Others deem

it a secondary matter, pay little attention to it, are seldom present at its sessions, have nothing whatever to do with its management, and do not know how to address it. They make a fatal mistake. The pastor ought to remember that he is the pastor of the Sunday-school. In it he comes into contact with the best part of his congregation. There he finds the workers and the children whom he is to mould for the future. He neglects it at his peril. He cultivates it to his profit. Here is a field for his best ability. Here he can accomplish what he will not in the pulpit. I give it as my experience after twenty-five years in the pastorate that no part of Church work exceeds that of the Sunday school for opportunities and results.

The true pastor is a Sunday-school man. He must be a teacher, as a disciple of the great Teacher. I do not say that he must have a class, or act as superintendent; but he must know how to teach and how to superintend. He must be an expert, an overseer. He must be to the Sunday-school what the general manager is to the mercantile or industrial establishment. He must be able to direct others, and also to detect flaws and apply remedies. He must have a lofty ideal of what the Sunday-school ought to be, and must have training and tact to bring it up toward his high standard. The Sunday-school will never realize its mission until we have the pastor described.

But, you will say that such a pastor does not exist. Then I answer, we must make him. We will not ask all the existing pastors to resign. There may be hope of some of them yet; but we will begin to make the new pastor. He will have to start in the primary department as a child, and come up through all the grades of the school, and occupy most of its offices, teaching and administrative. All this is easily possible in the life of the candidate for the ministry. It is not only possible, but expected of him. A young man who takes no interest in Sunday-school and is not recognized therein as efficient is not fit for the ministry. I say it advisedly from personal observation of too diffident or too indifferent young men who subsequently failed in the high office.



During the years of study in the academy, College and Seminary the candidate for the pastorate must keep in touch with the Sunday-school as pupil, teacher or officer. If he neglect this, he will discover to his sorrow that he has lost the habit of attendance, the love for the work, and the facility for doing it.

Moreover, there ought by all means to be somewhere in his course special training for the work of teaching, for the pastor must be pre-eminently a teacher. The Seminary curriculum ought to afford opportunity for the acquisition of pedagogical principles and methods. It belongs legitimately to practical theology or catechetics. The pastor ought to know not only the *what*, but also the *how*. Of what use is power unless it be properly applied? Theology is a miser's treasure unless it be coined and circulated in an acceptable medium.

Our many-sided Luther in his *Table Talk* has this to say in reference to the importance of a knowledge of teaching: "I would have no one chosen for a preacher who has not previously been a school teacher. But at the present time our young men want to become preachers at once, to avoid the labor of school-keeping. When one has taught about ten years, then he can give it up with a good conscience."

The intrinsic importance of pedagogy is recognized by the State in requiring a knowledge of it of the public school teacher. Every graduate of a Normal School must have a theoretical and practical acquaintance with the science and the art of teaching, obtained in the class-room, and by actual practice in the Model-School.

The need of instruction in this subject has been forced upon the attention of our Faculties and the Trustees of our higher institutions, and instruction is being provided.

The older and more thoughtful pastors already in the field ought to take up the study of child-training in all its bearings, including psychology, child-nature, and pedagogy.

We must learn from the public-school. It is thoroughly organized, has methods that are the fruit of experience. The pastor must study it, and apply its principles to the supplemental and higher work of the Sunday-school. It seems passing strange that we have been so slow to realize that the Sun-

day-school is after all a school more than anything else. Religious information must be disseminated and instruction inculcated in exactly the same way as other truth. The facts of psychology and the principles of pedagogy are as applicable to the boy on Sunday as they are on Monday.

### III. THE PASTOR MUST USE READY-MADE TEACHERS.

It is not unlikely that our Sunday-school pastor will have the gratification to find some excellent teachers already in the school, teachers who have the right spirit and who have learned the art of teaching by actual experience in the Sunday-school itself or in the profession of teaching. It seems to me that Christian professional teachers might be secured in larger measure than they now are. They ought to be able to do the work better than the average Church member.

There is no good reason why the Church should not secure expert teachers for the infant school, and the Bible classes or training classes, and pay a moderate salary. It is certainly quite as proper to pay the teacher, as to pay the preacher and the organist and the choir. The expert teacher's salary would be a profitable investment. While the payment of all the teachers in any school is not feasible, and not even the payment of one in many schools; yet the larger schools in towns which have from 400 to 1000 scholars can not afford to do without a few expert teachers at any reasonable expense. The larger congregations could profitably utilize several trained lay-workers, male or female, who might combine teaching with parish work. They might give an hour's teaching during some week-day afternoon to such children as might come to the Church.

Perhaps the day will come when our best Sunday-schools will be conducted more and more upon the plans and methods of the ordinary school. When the importance of clean cut religious instruction is more fully realized, it will be seen that it is incongruous, if not culpable, to allow almost anyone to teach the children on Sundays while we are satisfied only with the best on week days.

Would it not be the wise plan to divide the school into a few large classes, give them separate rooms, engage competent

teachers, and allow the classes to pursue the rational methods which are applied to all good schools?

#### IV. MOST OF THE TEACHERS WILL HAVE TO BE SELECTED.

Our Sunday-school pastor or his competent assistant, superintendent or teacher, will have to *make* most of his teachers under present conditions. And he will begin with those already at work. It would be folly to turn them all out, or to proclaim their unfitness. He must use the material at hand. Of course, some must be gently eliminated. The frivolous, the down-right ignorant, the unfaithful, and any whose morals are not above suspicion must be crowded out somehow. Put up your standard. Expect much of them. Go and sit with their classes. They will retire to the ranks by and by. And do not perpetuate their kind by new admissions. It is better and easier to keep them out than to put them out.

Having eliminated unsuitable persons, the pastor will find that new teachers will be needed at once, and continually. Removals from the teaching force constantly occur, and these vacancies must be filled at once. How shall sufficient and capable teachers be secured? Shall the pastor chide the congregation for its neglect in not fostering the school, and in tones of severity call for volunteers? Never! If you love your school, I beg you, do not depend upon volunteers. You may not get them at all, or if you do, you will probably regret that they came. They will be made up, ten to one, of incompetents, who offer themselves from a mistaken sense of duty. The goody-goody element will be largely represented. Many a man or woman who has the making of a teacher in him will not come, because of modesty. In selecting teachers you must follow the directions of the Master, who said, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he send forth laborers into his harvest." I fear that this preliminary step is too often neglected. The prayer for divine guidance already indicates the seriousness of the task. It puts us into the proper frame, and sharpens our insight into character and fitness. The prayer does not imply that the Lord will send them without an instrumentality to call them. As in the call to the ministry, the proof of the divine call is the call of the Church; so in the call of

the Sunday-school teacher, there must and will be the coöperation of the human with the divine.

The pastor and his helpers must be on the lookout for the right kind of persons who may be trained as teachers. In his pastoral visits, in his visits perchance to the day-school, especially in his catechetical classes, and in his Bible class (if he have one) he will come into contact with the very people whom he needs. Further, he will widen his knowledge of proper candidates by inquiring of his best teachers concerning the members of their classes. If we believe in Christ and in his providential care of his church, it seems entirely reasonable that he has available material on hand in every living congregation out of which to make teachers.

And now what qualifications should be looked for in the sought teacher?

a. *Piety.* The question is often asked whether respectable, intelligent non-professors may not be asked to teach. They may be apt and interesting; yet they cannot, from the nature of the case, be true teachers. They do not have the right spirit. They are not proper examples. Their influence can not lead children or young people to Christ. They have not the true life and hence can not inspire. True devotion to Christ must ever be the first qualification of the teacher of religion. The unspiritual does not only not know Christ, but he can not interpret the deeper meaning of the Book. He can only be used provided the pastor can supplement his work.

b. *Intelligence.* It is folly to set an ignorant person to teach. The teacher must know and understand his business. He ought to be a good Bible scholar, or at least a good Bible student. He must be acquainted with the Way as revealed, if he would lead. He need not be learned, but he must have sufficient education to merit the respect of his class and to understand his subject.

c. *Sympathy.* By this I mean human love, a love for children. Where this is lacking there will be feeble response and diminishing attendance. A true lover of humanity is generally a good knower of human nature with its "kinks" and foibles. A teacher must be one with his class. He must not

be alien to their life. He must enter into the joys and sorrows of his pupils.

d. Aptitude. The person sought must be apt to teach. This is largely a gift, though like all qualities it may be cultivated. Unless the root of this be in the teacher he cannot do good work, in spite of other qualifications.

e. Sex. I believe, on the whole, it is best in the grades above the primary, to have the teacher teach those of the same sex. It seems to me that women can best understand women ; and men can best know men. The teacher knows the point of view, and the peculiarities and weaknesses of his or her own sex better than of the opposite.

#### V. MOST OF THE TEACHERS WILL HAVE TO BE TRAINED.

Having secured the teacher of the right spirit and capacity, he must be trained. The simplest way would be to send him to a training school, provided he can go. I sometimes wish we had a lay training school annex to all of our theological Seminaries. There are various schools now that profess to train teachers. With these, however, I have no personal acquaintance. We know, of course, about the Chautauquas or summer-schools, and also something of correspondence schools, these various agencies are all helpful.

Of the many religious conventions none are so useful as the right kind of a Sunday-school institute, where experienced and competent teachers meet for consultation and inspiration. These meetings have been crowded too much into the back ground by other gatherings, and need to be revived. The State Unions are doing good work for the schools through their staff of instructors.

Our Christian colleges and academies for both sexes might do more district work in the line of equipping our young people to do Church work when they return home. Alas ! too many are diverted from this work in the school, and become mere zeros. Let us hope that the teaching of the English Bible in our higher schools will give us good material from which to select our teachers.

But the training of the teacher will have to be done in large measure right at home in connection with the school. Our

Sunday-school pastor must work out this problem. If he can not secure the proper instructor, he must do it himself. He can do no better work elsewhere, nor spend his time more profitably than by training others to do the same kind of work he is doing. He will thus multiply himself.

Time fails me to outline a plan in full. In general, however, I may say that teacher training demands a Normal Class, in which the *how* may be taught. This will probably be best held during the week, not necessarily the year through.

Where the teachers are many and where, therefore, there may be a number of absentees, it is well to have the candidate teachers in a Bible class which studies, the lesson one Sunday ahead of the school, that they may be prepared to act on short notice as substitutes. A teacher's meeting is also indispensable to the best school. But I cannot enter into details. I would only insist that the conditions requisite to the making of a teacher and, hence, of a good school, are possible almost everywhere. I need not say that the matter involves much thought, labor, and self-denial, nor need I add that it will amply repay the most faithful effort.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### A LITERARY STUDY OF JOB.

BY REV. W. B. CARNEY, A.M.

Great books imply great authors. Themes are greater than men. Themes touch upon the infinite, the eternal; men are of the here and now. The oldest subjects are still the newest and least understood—life, soul, death, God. They are riddles unsolved, depths unsounded, heights unattained. Like some inaccessible mountain, they force themselves upon the attention of all dwellers in the valley of life. They entice the strongest to draw near, to climb, to explore, only to dazzle the eye and bewilder the brain with the brightness of the sun glow, and create despair on the dark brink of some unspanned chasm.

How few of the uninspired minds have returned from their

searchings with any solution of life's enigmas! But great attempts immortalize. Daring ascent and majestic thought have sculptured some names high up on the mountain's granite side. One inscription is written in Greek, Latin and English—Homer, Virgil, Milton—a rare trio of languages and men, who had the same theme, sought the same end:

"To justify the ways of God (or gods) to men." Above them, in still older and nobler characters, would be inscribed a fourth name, in Hebrew—if we knew it—the author of the first and most satisfactory attempt of the human reason to explain the problem of God's relation to life's joys and sorrows—the Book of Job. This unique distinction is denied Moses, who of all the Hebrew seers was most equal to the task. It is objected that he was not in possession of so complete a solution of the problem in his day. None other of them, however, is esteemed worthy of receiving the honor. Were he known, his name, as well as his sublime outburst of faith in a just recompense for all we suffer, through one who "lives," would be "engraven" in a more lasting record than the rocks yield to an "iron pen."

Did the author write actual history, or only parable? In both Jewish and Greek Canons, Job is classed with the "Writings." The majority of the Jewish interpreters in the Talmud pronounce it historical. It is said, however, that not all the "Wise" were of that opinion. One Rabbi is quoted as saying, "Job existed not, and was not created; but he is a parable." Between these widely contrasted views lie the opinions of the present day critics. But for *some* historical foundation for the book, there is very satisfactory proof.

It cannot be classed with parables. It has an exhilarating atmosphere of reality and fact about it. It is not defined by the rules of parabolic literature. Such writings are short, introduce few characters and these for specific purposes only, omitting all biographical and circumstantial matter, that the main doctrine to be taught be not obscured thereby. The allegory, though longer, has likewise no place for extraneous facts and details. In Job, such historical and circumstantial



material is abundant, especially in the Prologue, chap. 1 and 2, and the Epilogue, 42 : 7-17. The homes of Job and of each of his four friends are given. The marauding bands are particular tribes—Sabeans and Chaldeans—not merely “robbers” as would better befit a parabolic treatment. The home life of Job, the feasting of his sons and daughters together, his offering sacrifices for them, his exact wealth—all this is a picture of non-Jewish life and customs unessential and foreign to the doctrine to be taught. If we admit the genuineness of the first two and last chapters—and only the most radical of the critics would lop them off—we have very clear and convincing evidence of a historical basis, at least, for the poem. An irreducible minimum of historical facts would include the names and homes of Job and his friends, Job's afflictions, the remarkable patience with which he endured them, and the way in which he finally emerged from them.

As external evidence, the most conclusive at our command, is the fact that other inspired writers refer to the Book as historical. Ezekiel 14 : 14—“Though these three men, Noah, Daniel and Job, were in it, (the famine) they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God.” Also Jas. 5 : 11—“Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord : that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy.” Evidently these writers believed in the whole Book as it stands today as the actual personal history of a real man. Would the Holy Spirit endeavor to comfort believers in trouble by reference to the example of a man whose existence was a matter of doubt, or by an allegory?

There are, however, some features of the Book which lead a thoughtful reader to question the actual occurrence of all things set forth. Among these may be mentioned Satan's interviews with Jehovah. This may or may not have occurred. The character of the numbers used to designate Job's family and possessions seems artificial. There are seven sons, both before and after the calamity; seven thousand sheep; the friends remain sitting seven days and nights, without speaking. Job has

three daughters, both before and after his bereavement; three thousand camels; three friends came to comfort him who speak three times each, Zophar excepted; unless we agree with certain modern critics who would assign chap. 27 : 7-23 to him as his third address. If we construe the "double" amount of property, the portion after Job's restitution, exactly, we feel a like sense of studied arrangement. This, however, we are not required to do. As to the round numbers used in the naming of the herds and flocks, Kitto remarks in *Daily Bible Illustrations* that, in Holy Scripture, round numbers are more frequent in designating large quantities than exact numerals. As to the use of "seven," he says that its frequent scriptural use gave it oft times a secondary significance of "several," "an indefinite quantity." As for "three," it is not poetic, nor is it used as often as many other numerals, in the Bible.

There is a formality and poetic tone to the announcements made by the one only servant who in each several case escapes the calamity "to tell" the dumb recipient of the quickly succeeding evils. Fear and grief do not use set speeches in expressing these turbulent emotions. Concerning the highly ornate and figurative language, and the strong and sustained argumentation, much may be attributed to the Oriental temperament and training. This is much given to picturesque and exaggerated statements. These people have time and inclination for oral and extemporaneous discussion, and thereby acquire facility which is less common among the more practical Western nations.

The most satisfactory view, undoubtedly, is the one arrived at by Luther, and accepted by the more conservative critics of today, viz. ; the existence of Job, and the substantial accuracy of the Book are not to be questioned. As a record of actual facts, however, we must use it with discrimination. We can undoubtedly accept it with Delitzsch, Driver and Davidson, as "poetically treated history." Or view it with Prof. Sayce as "a Hebrew adaptation of a remnant of Edomite tradition," understanding tradition as unrecorded history.

The author, whoever he was or whenever he lived, has suc-

ceeded in giving the story a patriarchal cast. The language is ancient in form. The hero lived before the age of man was shortened to "three score years and ten." Sacrifice was performed not at a central altar, but for the family by the father as priest. The nations generally had not yet apostatized from the one true God. The oldest form of idolatry, a worship of the sun and moon, is apparently the only kind known. God was known by his oldest Semitic titles of Eloah and El Shaddai. Job's wealth, as Abraham's, is reckoned in herds and flocks, horses and mules being wanting. The "piece of money" (42 : 11) given him by his friends in his returned prosperity is considered a primitive uncoined piece, possibly of the value of a sheep.

Davidson,\* however, asserts that "the antique color" of the Book is "thin; and that the author is a true Israelite and betrays himself to be so at every turn, however wide his sympathy be with other peoples, and however great his power of reanimating the past." He claims that the theme of the Book is too recent, that only some great calamity, such as the captivity, could give such a despondent view of life. "The theme here discussed and the manner of discussing it necessitate a long previous history in which the doctrine of the three friends had become the current and orthodox explanation of the facts of life. The history of the Old Testament shows that only at a comparatively late period were these maxims questioned; and when we find them not only questioned but discussed in the thorough manner of the Book of Job, we may be sure it was not composed till, at least, the closing period of the monarchy." It is likewise contended that such a passage as 12 : 17-21 with its mention of kings and counsellors, spoiled and captive, imply a knowledge, on the part of the writer, of "the history of nations, if not of the actual political changes brought about by great nations, as Assyria and Babylon."

In reply, it may be said that suffering is as old as the race, and attempts to explain the cause of it as old as suffering. (We know the kings of Abraham's time were not loathe to quarrel

\* Quoted in Hasting's Dictionary, Art. Job.

and take captives). And if general "disorder and misery," as well as "personal sufferings," must have been features in the life of the author, there were plenty occasions for it long before the beginning of the monarchy. When there "was no king in Israel, every man did what was right in his own eyes." There was possibly some disorder still earlier. At least, no modern man envies the lot of Noah, Abram, Jacob or Moses. We may not know of all their "personal sufferings" either.

Efforts have been made in the interests of a late date to find traces of the Law in the Book. 22 : 6 and 24 : 9 are compared with Ex. 22 : 26 as to the taking of pledges; 31 : 26-28 with Deut. 17 : 2-7 as to punishment of idolatry by the judges. Suffice it to say, however, that no conclusion can be drawn from these few similarities. In fact, it seems to me, since the Exodus and the miraculous keeping of the Israelites in their journeyings were unparalleled events in a nation's history, it is highly probable that the author of Job would have found therein illustrations of the point at issue, God's interest in the affairs of men, had they already occurred. The absence of any reference at all is significant. As to parallel passages in Ps., Jer., Isaiah, and the minor prophets, who did the copying, it is beyond any one to speak positively. The similarity, even in the suffering servant of Jehovah of Deutero-Isaiah, is not so close as to conclude that either of the Books was dependent upon the other. And if so, is not the antique character, its uniqueness, its independent mold and spirit strong presumption in favor of Job's being the earliest of them all?

It is conceded that in 1 Chr. 21 : 1, we have the name Satan used as a proper noun, with a conception similar to the one in Job. We are not asked, therefore, to date the composition of Job later than that of Chronicles, which is given as sometime in the 4th century B. C. "The references to Ophir, Job 22 : 24; 28 : 16 give a *terminus a quo* in the Solomonic period."

But reasoning thus, we are entitled to a much earlier time as a possible date. The land settled by Ophir, southeast Arabia (Gen. 10 : 29), has the most ancient and best established claim to be the land of Ophir of Solomon's day. Ophir lived

three generations prior to Abraham (Cf. Gen. 10 : 15-29 and 11 : 18-26). Why may we not, therefore, claim on this point, that the date *may* be as early as Ophir's settlement of the land of gold?

It is a noteworthy fact that, in purely secular literature, delight is taken in pushing the date of composition as far back in the life of the nation, or as early in the lifetime of the author, as possible. The sacred books of the East are jealously guarded in the shrines of antiquity. The spirit of investigators in the West to-day is to brush aside ruthlessly any appearance of age and veneration, lest we be caught worshipping the traditions of our elders. Well, when once Christianity is convinced that it is the great Prophet who is teaching and leading it thus, we may be content in realizing that we know at least, "what we worship," even if it cannot be in the venerated mountains of our fathers.

The poetry of Job is that of the Hebrew style of versification. Rhythm and rhyme are absent. The irregular musical pulse of the author's feelings is the only law followed to determine the varying length of lines, and the number of them combined to form the strophe, or poetic paragraph, whose chief characteristic is the parallelism of thought and form of expression. This style of writing is well suited for expressing the epigrammatic wisdom of Proverbs. The author of Job shows remarkable skill in adapting it to his long poem without sacrificing grace, beauty or freshness.

The strength and beauty of this master piece, consist rather in its bold conceptions, such as the councils in heaven and the greatness and cyclonic swiftness of the calamities; in the well-defined contrasts in the friends, their positive assertions and ever-increasing anger, and the blind yet patient faith of the hero, all which is painted on a back-ground of nature's various moods—the quiet shining of the star-gemmed sky, the darkness and terror of thunder and tornado—touched into warmth and life by striking similes, bold metaphors, and unmatched use of interrogation.

From the time of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429 A. D.,)

the poem has been characterized as "dramatic." German critics have styled it "a didactic poem in dialogue form, with dramatic development." Milton and Godet find it "epic," and G. Baur, "didactic lyrical." One is reminded, in its perusal, at times, of the chained Prometheus of Sophocles; again, of various scenes in *Paradise Lost*: and of events in the great Greek and Latin Epics of Homer and Virgil. But it defies classification. It is "a law unto itself, and has influenced subsequent writers whose names stand among the highest in literature, yet who, by general consent, are, merely from the literary point of view, outsoared and outshone by their great prototype."\*

Job was of the land of Uz, a country whose name may be from three possible settlers:—the grandson of Shem (Gen. 10 : 23), the son of Nahor (Gen. 22 : 21,) or a descendant of Esau (Gen. 36 : 28.) It is variously located. But the country of Edom, east of the Gulf of Akabah, about latitude 30° N., is quite generally accepted by late explorers. "Three kings, according to the LXX., appear as friends of the powerful Edomite chief Job of the land of Uz. Eliphaz from Teman (between Edom and Midian), Bildad from Shuph (on the west bank of the Euphrates, north of the Kaldu district,) and Zophar from Maân."† This latter place is located a little to the N. E. of the northern limit of the Gulf of Akabah. "Elihu is from Bâzu (—Buz of O. T.) situated in Yemania." This district is on latitude 25° N., about two-thirds of the eastward distance from the Red sea towards the Persian Gulf.

The city of Job was on the edge of a desert. He engaged in agriculture as well as grazing, and was familiar with the minerals of his country. By means of the passing travelers whom he delighted to entertain, he kept informed of the remoter lands. Though a worshipper of the true God, he was in the midst of those who worshipped the heavenly bodies, whose names and splendor he knew. The Lord describes him with a rare title—"perfect and upright." He is characterized

\* Hasting's Dictionary.

† Hilprecht Explorations in Bible Lands p. 747.

as "the greatest of the men of the East." His home life is beautiful and devout, free from restrictions upon his daughters such as were later introduced into Eastern social customs. Intellectually, he is far superior to the four men who attempt to argue with him.

The first test of Job's integrity—loss of property and children—is borne with sublime resignation. Disease comes, the Adversary's greater trial; but again Job's lips bless God. Time, however, tells upon his spirit. And after the arrival of the "friends" and their week long silence, he gives way to his long suppressed emotions, and curses his birthday, wishes for death, and raises the question of the Book, until this day not wholly clear—why a kind Providence permits those to be born who must live a life of great pain? It is worth noticing in passing that Job had an intimation of his coming calamity (3 : 25,) though he does not see God's goodness in thus forewarning him.

Eliphaz, presumably the oldest of the friends, essays the first reply. He is mild and sympathetic, compliments Job's wisdom and goodness, and gives the point at issue a more specific turn. Is Job's calamity due to a righteous judgment upon his wrong doing? The foolish take root for a short time only, the fruit of their labor is afterwards taken away, and we need only to wait to see all wicked thus punished in this life, he asserts.

In these opening addresses, we see the beginning of Job's sins, rebellion and a questioning of God's love and care. We see also wherein the friends are not reasoning consistently. Their general proposition that God punishes the transgressor and blesses the righteous, is admitted by all, Job included. He contends, however, that his own case is exceptional. The friends argue that it is not, and base their proof upon the fact that he suffers. They fail to foresee, the possible outcome, the actual outcome—blessing and prosperity to make up to the sufferer for all that he endured. This is one error. Eliphaz seems to be conscious of *another* purpose of God in sending punishment, viz., "chastening, which Elihu afterwards asserts



as a very common act of Providence; but lack of positive conviction, or anger, perhaps, at Job's obstinacy, causes the friends to forget or ignore this important aid in the final solution attained.

Of the vision of Eliphaz, Barnes remarks, "It is impossible to conceive of anything more sublime." Eliphaz, however, misapplies it. Its teaching is, "no man is pure, just." All men alike are, therefore, liable to punishment. Why is Job especially punished. Because of the greatness of his evils, is he, therefore, greatly evil? This opinion is not universally true, though it has always been believed. Christ met with it in His day. (See Luke 13 : 4.) It is still a common belief. The story of Job teaches us otherwise.

In reply, Job asserts that his calamity which is "heavier than the sands of the sea" and the "perverse things" said of him by his friends, justify him in his wish for death, especially since life at best is swifter than a weaver's shuttle, and "spent without hope;" and asks God why He doesn't pardon him, since his end is near.

Bildad, who replies, is less eloquent and delicate than Eliphaz, but harsher and keener. He upholds God's justice, cruelly refers to the sudden calamity which overtook the children as proof of *their* wickedness, and enforces it all by quoting from some older poem a striking illustration from nature of the hypocrite's character and fate :

"Can the rush grow up without mire?  
Can the flags grow without water?  
While it is yet in its greenness, and not cut down,  
It withereth before any other herb.  
So are the paths of all that forget God,  
And the hypocrite's hope shall perish." 8 : 8-18.

In Job's reply, he acknowledges God's *power* over the destiny of men, but contends that He inflicts because He has might rather than right on His side :

"He breaketh me with a tempest  
And multiplieth my wounds without cause." 9 : 17.

Job does not claim to be what was said of him by God himself, i. e., "perfect and upright:"

"If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me." 9 : 20.

He does claim, though, that God does not discriminate :

"He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked." 9 : 22.

Throughout chap. 10, he asks God for evidence of sin, the justice of punishing the innocent, and reasons for this continued and increasing torment of a life which had no say in its being brought into existence.

Zophar is harsh, rude, cruel, bitter in accusation, but adds nothing new to the contention. He calls Job's views "lies," his addresses mockings, and unfeelingly advises him to stretch out his hands to God in submission, that he may be enabled to lift up his leprous face "without spot." In his wish, "Oh that God would open His lips against thee ;" we have an intimation as to the way in which the debate will be finally settled.

In reply, Job covers the same ground—God's sovereignty—but shows that it is manifested more by His government of the world than by any recognition of merit or demerit in men. He asserts his fixed determination unmistakably in "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him," which foreshadows Satan's defeat. He sees a very pathetic and disheartening prospect for man in distress and near the verge of the tomb, inasmuch as there is no certain knowledge of a restoring and rejuvenating life :

"There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again ;"  
But man dieth, and wasteth away ;  
Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" 14 : 7, 10.

In his awful despair, he asks God for an interview (13 : 22,) and gives us an additional clue to the final outcome.

When Eliphaz again speaks, he is less mild and polite than formerly, becomes sarcastic and personal. Job's views, he thinks, would hinder prayer and annul faith :

"Thou doest away with fear  
And hinderest devotion before God." 15 : 4.

To warn Job of the final result of his obstinacy, he quotes from former "wise men" that the wicked live :

"In houses which are ready to become heaps," a very striking figure where houses are built of clay and the walls easier

for robbers to pierce than the doors. (See chap. 4 : 19 and 24 : 16.)

"Miserable comforters!" retorts Job, speaking "vain" and harsh words. Were their conditions reversed, he avers, "the moving of my lips should assuage your grief." He reaches the climax of his bold rebellion and poignant despair in the following fierce arraignment of the Almighty :

"I was at ease, but He hath broken me asunder ;  
He hath also taken me by the neck,  
And shaken me to pieces,  
And set me up for His mark.  
His arches compass me round about,  
He cleaveth my reins asunder, and doth not spare ;  
He poureth out my gall upon the ground.  
He breaketh me with breach upon breach ;  
He runneth upon me like a giant." 16 : 12-14.

Bildad's increased anger shows progress towards a solution rather than any new argument produced by him. Under various striking figures, he reiterates his former position, *the wicked alone suffer great calamity*. In Job's reply to him, there is a great change visible. He indirectly rebukes the harshness and ill-treatment of his friends by referring to the magnitude of his grief—property, home, children, wife, and friends—all dead or gone from him. He makes a direct appeal then for sympathy :

"Have pity upon me, have pity upon me,  
O ye my friends ; for the hand of God hath touched me." 19 : 21

The pathetic request is in vain. Will he yield to despair and curse his God? This is Satan's last resource—the contempt of the friends who came to console. From their stolid and frigid pride, he turns for comfort to his faith in his ultimate vindication, and breaks forth into the best known and most sublime passage of the Book, a clarion note of defiance and victory :

"I know that my Redeemer liveth,  
Yet, in my flesh shall I see God." 19 : 25-27.

Though the common exegesis concerning Job's faith in the resurrection of the body is comforting to us, and allowable from the text, it seems to me not to be the natural one. The question is not one of future life or of recompense, but of vindica-

tion of his integrity in this life. The word translated *Redeemer* signifies also *vindicator, deliverer*. Job, therefore, means to say, "I know that my vindicator, my deliverer, liveth," and before I die I shall see Him on my side. "Be ye afraid of the sword; for wrathful are the punishments of the sword, that ye may know there is a judgment." (verse 29. Amer. R. V.) This is a fitting climax, thus interpreted, of the long struggle between Job and the powers arrayed against him. It marks the defeat of Satan in his attempts to make Job "curse" God to His "face." We are given a hint concerning the fate of the friends in the intimation that "there is a judgment."

From this point on, Job has his friends completely worsted in the discussion, which is seen in their ever increasing wrath and personal abuse rather than argument, in contrast with Job's abundance of material and calmer tone. To Zophar's attempt to show the futility of a wicked man's endeavor to escape from the direful "heritage appointed," Job boldly asserts the opposite: The wicked prosper, are happy, "rejoice at the sound of the organ," and at death, righteous and wicked, "both alike, lie down in the dust." For proof he appeals to men of the world:

"Have ye not asked them that go by the way,  
That the wicked is reserved to [or spared in] the day of destruction?"  
21 : 29-30.

Eliphaz intimates sarcastically that since Job is so wise, perhaps God is punishing him because of fear of him. He charges him with specific iniquities—forgetting the "widows" and "fatherless," of robbing "the naked of their clothing," of practical atheism in doubting God's knowledge of and interest in the world. His final remarks are milder, and offer hope of recompense in power and "gold as dust," if he will return to the Almighty who saves "the humble person."

In Job's answer, he re-asserts his integrity—"My foot hath held his steps" (23 : 11), proceeds to muse upon the ways of the wicked, when Bildad interrupts with a few trite remarks as to God's power and greatness, and man's lack in comprehending Him. This thought Job takes up and endorses in most

beautiful imagery, emphasizing, though, as heretofore, His remoteness from men :

"How little a portion is heard of Him!"

Having waited, apparently, for a reply, he "continued his parable," re-asserting, "My righteousness I hold fast;" comments on the lot of the wicked; and closes his monologue with a contrast between works of God which can be understood, and "wisdom," which, in the sense of the principles of true and righteous government which direct the course of this world's affairs, is inscrutable."

Some of the men who are endeavoring to re-arrange the Scriptures, prefer to give chap. 27 : 7-23 to Zophar, that he may have a third speech; others would annex it to Bildad's attempt (chap. 25), to help him a little in amount. Chap. 28 is considered out of its place, even if it were a part of the original poem, because of its apparent acceptance of views which are afterwards more fully discussed. As to the matter of unity, I fail to see any gain by re-arrangement. Chap. 29 seems as much in place where it stands as if it followed 27 : 6, or 27 : 23. As to the doctrine taught in 27 and 28, it does seem that Job is wandering somewhat from his theme. But opposition has ceased, he is at liberty to muse at will upon any phase of the subject which his weakened body and troubled mind may suggest or delight in. There are many evidences in his remarks that his mind is suffering with his body. There is constant repetition and frequent change of thought, (see 27 : 4, 5 for an example), in his addresses.

Throughout chap. 30, he reviews his past and present conditions and stations among the citizens of his town, then passes on to challenge God to convict him of any one of several sins—falsehood, adultery, avarice, idolatry, murder, lack of hospitality—some of which Eliphaz had charged him with. If I am guilty, he defiantly cries,

"Then let mine arm fall from my shoulder,  
And mine arm be broken from the bone!" 31 : 22.

No wonder "these three men ceased to answer Job!" Who can argue with one who challenges the Almighty to prove him

in error by annihilating his body? The debate is at a deadlock. Both sides are silent, neither one convinced.

At this juncture Elihu appears. His youth hitherto restrained him, but his "wrath" gets the better of his modesty. He lacks force, is loquacious, exceedingly familiar, addressing "Job" by name, and has an assumed air of superior knowledge. However, he shows a good memory in recalling remarks of Job, gives comment and advances other theories of God's knowledge and care of men. He emphasizes calamity as a favorite means of God to chasten men, and repentance as a sure way to regain His favor. He accuses Job of "rebellion" against God, of speaking without knowledge, of false accusation of the justness of Him who notes all "the ways of a man" (34 : 21), and of presuming that his calamities would have been the same had he been wicked instead of "perfect." God is just,

"He preserveth not the life of the wicked,  
But giveth right to the poor" [afflicted].

As he proceeds to speak of God's wisdom and power, he seemingly illustrates from the manifestations of a gathering storm. He breaks off abruptly, as if himself overcome, and Jehovah answers Job out of the whirlwind—the long desired interview, at last at hand.

Both literary and theological objections are raised to the address of Elihu as a part of the original poem. It is argued that the Book has unity with this omitted; that the matter and style are not of the same high order as that of the rest of the production, and the language more Aramaic. The only new doctrine advanced, that suffering is used by Jehovah to educate and purify men, is a view of later ages. But so much of differences in opinion is to be attributed to the mental attitude and point of view of the reader, that conclusions on this point cannot but vary. Elihu reviews the whole argument. He simply states more clearly and emphasizes what Eliphaz touched on in passing. "Happy is the man whom God correcteth; therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty." 5 : 17. As to the weaker and prolix style, is it not

a youth from a far land who is speaking? Why may not all these differences of style be intentional on the part of the writer?

As to omission of his name when the Almighty pronounces approval and disapproval, we might with equal propriety infer that since God doesn't say in the epilogue what he thinks of Job's wife and her counsel, and of that very important character, Satan, that therefore the part about these two persons must be by a later hand. But we know what Jehovah thought of these three—and Elihu's views are not condemned.

His work was necessary. Job agreed to be silent only on the condition that he be convinced of his error and sin. This was reserved for the Almighty. But to hear Him, Job must cease to rage and rebel. He must be calmed and silenced. Elihu does this. God's herald of power is the artillery of the heavens. His assurance of love and care comes in a still, small voice which finds us waiting neath the shadow of a rock. Job ceased to complain, listened, and heard Him. We see His greatness in the mighty behemoth and defiant leviathan. We see the Father heart, the love of "Our Father," in provision for the sparrows and the royal apparel of the field lilies. Job saw God in the visible creation—a God who cares for all things great and small, and at once *knew* he could trust Him. Immediately he was sorry for his distrust, his complaint, his questionings. His questions the Almighty did not answer; but when we can *rest* in His arms, what does it matter? Do we care to understand? And does it concern our happiness how long we may live, or whether we shall receive "double" for all our losses. We know that, if He choose, He can give us a "hundred fold in this life." Having seen the vision and heard His voice, we are content and happy in our lot. "The reasoner and skeptic complain that the issue has been evaded; the religious man knows that he has not shirked it, but *left it behind him*, when he bows his head in self abasing prayer, after a face-to-face vision of God."



## ARTICLE VIII.

## THE SENSE OF THE UNIVERSAL IN ART.

BY THEO. B. STORK, A.M.

A clumsy expression truly, and but vaguely suggestive of what is meant, nevertheless it signifies a truth that applies to all art, music, poetry, painting, even sculpture, but particularly to the greatest of all, the novel and drama.

Art may be said to be the interpretation of the Universal through the particular and concrete. It is the soul's window, through which it peers out upon vast expanses of emotion that lie beyond the horizon of the actual, realizes by its aid what can never be its own in experience. Art blends with narrow individual experience, the experience of the race, of the world, of even the Universe itself, looming dark and shadowy out of impenetrable starry space.

In all great works of art, there is this note of the Universal, faint, almost latent at times, then at others, as in some of the highest poetry, dominant, all pervading. By it art lifts the individual out of his individuality hedged, confined, fenced about with circumstance, the petty detail that makes up existence for each, puts him in touch with that Universe that lies about him which some inner sense prophesies but cannot realize for him.

Thus there comes to him that world of the imagination or rather that inner vision of his own possibilities illuminated, transmuted by the golden touch of Art. It is a gift of the simplest as of the greatest Art. Annie Laurie has it as much as Don Giovanni. The simple Scotch song makes real for its listener the passion of the race and through it he is made to know the possibilities and depth of feeling of himself as part of the race. He is a sharer, a partner in the universal fount of feeling as he can never hope to be in any actual experience of his own. It is the touch of the Universal that he feels; for it is not any one individual and particular passion that the song gives him, but the universal ideal passion, strip-

ped of the petty, the sordid, the mean, those inseparable companions of the individual and the real in this life of ours.

To be told that there was a real Annie Laurie and that the Max Welton Braes that were bonnie were nothing more than ordinary hills, perhaps bare and steep and rough, is to bring destruction down upon the song as a work of art. The sensitive soul revolts from these facts, for they rob it of that sense of the Universal and reveal the personal limitation of the feeling that actuated it.

The robbery thus committed is two fold: First, it takes away that idealization of the feeling which is necessary to the sense of the Universal, makes it not a universal, but a particular feeling of one particular man, for one particular woman; and secondly, with this particularity it fetches in all the disillusioning details of the particular. We thus know that in fact the song was not the expression of the universal, but was inspired and confined to one instead of interpreting all passion.

By this note of the universal, Art becomes the opportunity for the feeling of emotion, less intensely perhaps, but on a higher plane than actual experience allows. The feeling is more complex, more varied than is possible to the individual and actual experience of any one person, however fortunate or gifted. By its gate the individual passes into the lives and feelings and thoughts, suffers the emotions of all, appropriates them to himself and thus in a sense becomes partaker of the universal feelings of the world.

The degree of perfection to which this reaches varies with the many shapes and forms of Art. The painting of a gray and wintry sea with some storm tossed bark, slowly ploughing its way to the horizon, gives us this in one of its lowest terms. By it we are put in possession of the feeling of the sailor in his dreary life on the lonely bark, his eyes set on the far distant land beyond the sky line to which he voyages. The novel and the drama gives us this with more intensity, greater complexity, fuller richness of detail, and asks of us more complete surrender of ourselves to possession of another's thoughts, moods, passions. We are the *Dramatis Personae* of our

author, but we have again that sense of the Universal thought, mood, passion, which we vaguely realize in ourselves through this presentation of the particular. The fear, joy, hope, terror, despair, the whole gamut of emotion that thus comes to us brings with it that subtle but tremendous thrill of soul that we are thus sharing, the universal fear, joy, hope, terror, despair of the world, of the race. We are thus made in our feelings part of the great universal soul of which we know ourselves a part and which we dimly and vaguely long to realize in experience, unwitting that by experience this is impossible. The Mystic, the Pantheist might declare this a natural craving of the separate entity for union, absorption in the whole, for harmony and unity with the Universe. Thus art comes to the human spirit, cribbed, confined by the bars of petty circumstance, with magic key unlocks the cage, sets it free of mean and sordid limitations and makes it partaker of the universal thought and emotion.

There are satisfactions of this craving other than that afforded by works of Art, experiences which in a weaker degree tend to give the individual this sense of the Universal, that lift him up and out of his individuality and afford him glimpses of the universal in other ways. These may shed light upon the higher, more complex and delicate methods by which Art accomplishes the same results. Any experience that brings a man in close touch with great masses and varieties of things or of people, rapidly and with sharp emphasis, contains within it that thrilling sense of the Universal which we mean. A swift railway or carriage journey over beautiful and extensive scenery has something of this in it.

And again who of us has not felt the maddening excitement of the nerves when in the midst of a great throng of men, all animated by the same feeling, and sympathizing each with the other, they cheered or cried out under the impulse of a single, universal, overpowering, and common emotion. To the artistically susceptible such an experience is overwhelming in its sense of universality, the brotherhood of common and shared feeling. In like manner there is a thrill, inexplicable

but penetrating, in looking forth from an height upon the world of landscape below, the river a silvery serpent lying with long coils against the shadowy woodland, the white thread of road winding over the hill toward some distant Church spire among the trees.

Again, when from his tiny spot of earth the individual gazes by night at the stars, the same feeling in a profounder way comes to him, that sense of the universal that tells him he is part of some mighty whole, only dimly and at rare moments perceived by his earthly faculties.

These, however, are but glimpses, imperfect and accidental. Art of deliberate and carefully studied intention makes us partaker and sharer in that sense of the universal. It gives not merely that particular and special sunlight of Claude's picture, not that special and Carthaginian splendor of sea and sky in Turner's "Departure from Carthage," or "The Old Temeraire," not the particular passion that speaks in Romeo's words and lights his Juliet's eyes, not the particular joyousness of care-less, happy Zerlina in Don Giovanni's music. It gives you these, truly, but it gives you through them far more; it makes you in this sense of the universal realize for your narrow experience the sense of all sunlight in sea and sky, the passion of all lovers, the joyousness of all young and beautiful maidens. It sets an echo of infinity ringing through your soul, the deep profoundly stirring note of the Universal.

There are to be discerned in this accomplishment of art two elements. First, it is to be noted that Art casts off for men those vexing, hampering fetters of their own petty lives.

Philosophically, Art may be said to perform this great service for us; it abstracts the feeling it conveys, strips from it the adventitious and meretricious, that without which it is never known actually in experience, and that mars its purity for us, spoils its effects. Art takes the feeling it portrays and sets it like a precious jewel so that all its values may be appreciated. It idealizes particular experience for us as memory does in our recollections of the past, preserving what we enjoyed, omitting what were best forgotten. We all know

no present joys are like those of the past, cherished idealized and preserved to us by the handmaiden memory, or of the future sketched for us by imagination. And so Art, be it poetry, the novel, the drama, sculpture, painting, gives us its feeling without the drawbacks, the jarring notes that in all experience of actual feeling accompany and mar it.

In experience no man, however fortunate or well placed, escapes the irksome narrowness of his own individuality. The wearying sameness of routine, the small bothers of life, touch every life no matter how unceasing its pleasures. These very pleasures are marred by countless unavoidable mischances, the horse drops a shoe and spoils the ride, dyspepsia ruins the fine dinner, the tailor or the dressmaker makes an ill fitting garment. These and a thousand unmentionable pettinesses vex the smoothest lives. In addition and by no means least, there is the dullness and narrowness of scene, of circumstance, of people, from which all suffer in greater or less degree and with this dullness there comes a demand and craving for that second element that Art, even the meanest, supplies. For Art not only releases us from these fetters of our own individuality, it gives us in their place, secondly, the key of the fields of imagination, makes us possessors of the lives, the sufferings, the pleasures, experiences, good, bad or indifferent, of all our fellows, in short, makes us one with the great whole of humanity, and the Universe, gives us knowledge of that universal, whose absence makes our lives dull and monotonous.

But this universality of Art has even a wider meaning than that of simple enjoyment, it has its intellectual and philosophical side of the profoundest and deepest significance. The philosophers tell us that, "All forms of Art have this characteristic as their essence—that the moment of universality in them lifts their creation above the transitory and fleeting nature of the instant in which they are apprehended and detaches them from the relationship of place in the Universe."\*

Through Art, therefore, and the feelings which Art gives us, we get a direct knowledge, according to the idealists, of reality,

\* Haldane's Pathway to Reality.

of those universals which when realized in the particular make for us reality. By thinking, by perception, this is impossible; we cannot think the universal but we can realize it in this, that by experience of the particular we are compelled, in order to understand, to appreciate the particular experience, to apply those forms, that feeling, which is ours in common with all the race, with all things. But perhaps this view grows too Hegelian, too idealistic and transcendental for further urging into the depths of philosophic speculation. A few concrete examples from the poets may illustrate the points which abstract discussion can never make entirely clear. All great poetry reaches out for its highest effects into this extra-experimental region of the Universals; such as God, the future life, Immortality, Good and Evil, take these away and you take away from the greatest poems their meaning. For these ideas are all universals, not derived from or possibly derivable from experience, yet absolutely necessary to give experience intelligible reality, that is meaning. Without such meaning derived from these universals, experience is nothing, a void, a chaos. What would the *Inferno*, the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, be without these universals of all human thought; Eternal Life and its rewards and punishments, God, the Almighty power, the Judge of all the Earth, pronouncing right and wrong on the deeds of men.

It is not possible to take at random any true work of Art, however slight, that does not in some way call upon these for its power. The lover's passion, the murderer's fear, the patriot's self-devotion, all get their life from these. In "*Marpessa*" Stephen Phillips' dainty poem, the human lover cries out his feeling for his mistress, instinctively linking his individual human feeling of love (the particular) with the great universals of human thought and feeling, of the race and of the Universe.

"               beside thee  
I am aware of other times and lands  
Of birth far back, of lives in many stars."

Even the contemplative pleasure of a sunset grasps its highest note of feeling from the relation and suggestion it bears of

the universal. To make it real, to enable the individual man to understand the particular experience, it calls upon these.

"And the departing sun his glory owes  
To the eternal thoughts of creatures brief,  
Who think the thing that they shall never see."

I have in mind for another example a simple story read only the other day. It dealt with the homeliest details of experience, a mother, poor, hard-working, rustic, who had lost her only son. It told of her kitchen, her visiting her neighbors, her knitting, her tramping over the muddy country roads with her shawl over her head to keep out the biting east wind. Here was nothing but the trifling mean details of every-day life, familiar to us all. Now what was the transfiguring power by which Art lifted all these out of their transient setting and made them eternal verities beyond time, above the particular, and put them in touch with the universal, the permanent? It was the making them the expression, the conduit, of a mother's grief, the instrument of conveying to the reader that great universal human feeling, the common property of the race, which we know must survive all change, which we feel is part of the eternal, the universal, and which it is the object of all true Art to give us.

Perhaps these slight examples, just because they are slight, and seem not to call on the eternal verities, the mighty universals, so obviously for their interpretation, will serve better than the tragic or the deeply serious Art of the great masters which avowedly does so.

This noble Hegelian view of Art which I have tried to sketch is finely interpreted by Mr. Haldane in his "Pathway to Reality." He remarks, page 191: "It is the function of genius to lift us in the medium of what is particular and immediate to a higher plane and so to set the world in a new light." And again, page 184, he says, unfolding the artistic meaning of a Dutch landscape painting: "It moves us as Nature cannot. The reason is that the artist has detached and fashioned the scene in such a way as to lift us above the merely sensuous. A sense of aloofness from the contingency



of our surroundings comes to us and of aloofness from the particularism of ourselves." He remarks that the peasant's cottage, with its homely details, has passed away, but that "they express and engross us in that stillness and peace of nature which they do not symbolize as a word symbolizes a concept, but embody as a universal in individual form. They lift us toward a view of the world from the platform of those who are spectators of all time and all existence."

Or we may sum it up by saying that the moment of Art is eternal, snatched out of the particular and the immediate material of our experience it is set like the precious mosaic of some lapidary by itself, forever away from all its surroundings both precedent and succeedant, it exists by itself without past or future, an eternal present expressing the universal for the mind and itself. It is above time and beyond experience in that high region where mind exists only for mind, that is for the universals of which Art is one phase and aspect.

It makes the present moment of the particular, the phenomenal, the passing experience, immortal by making it the expression of some phase of mind, the expression of the universal, yet retaining all the reality and richness that the universal by itself, unexpressed in the evanescent experience, lacks.

So in picture, in story, in poem, some particular evanescent moment of experience, a lover's passion, a patriot's death, a mother's grief, an heroic deed, or it may be some far slighter incident, is taken up, idealized, made a crystal of feeling for all time.

This all pervading interpreting sense of the Universal that touches every feeling of the soul giving it its true value and learning, the poet Browning has aptly suggested in Bishop Blongram's Apology. He is treating of the impossibility of a permanent and abiding skepticism regarding the eternal verities.

"Just when we are safest there's a sunset touch,  
A fancy from a flower bell, some one's death,  
A chorus—ending from Euripides—  
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears.  
As old and new as Nature's self."

In all feeling and in all art as its expression, truly may it be said that deep calleth unto deep. Our feelings are our prophets, foretelling the great universal truths of God, good and evil, eternal life. We believe these because we must if we are to understand and interpret our own feelings of which Art is the particular and highest expression.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*A History of the Reformation.* By Thomas M. Lindsay, M.A., D.D., Principal, the United Free Church College, Glasgow. 1. The Reformation in Germany from its beginning to the Religious Peace in Augsburg. Pp. 16 and 528.

This book belongs to *The International Theological Library*, edited by Drs. Briggs and Salmond. As a history of the Reformation in Germany we regard this as the best in the English language. Pp. 1-188 are given to the discussion of the following subjects: *On the Eve of the Reformation; The Political Situation; The Renaissance; Social Conditions; Family and Popular Religions; Life in the Decades Before the Reformation; Humanism and the Reformation.*

These six chapters contain exactly the kind of information that is needed in order to make the subsequent history intelligible. The picture painted by the author has strong and distinct features. Evidently he has used both the original sources of information and the best studies of other writers. This part of the book is well worth reading.

From p. 189 to p. 416 we have a history of the German Reformation in the specific sense. But the author does not write history simply as a chronicler of events; but rather as a thinker and a philosopher, who seeks to ascertain the facts and to connect them with their causes. Hence we have before us, to a considerable extent, a philosophy of history. Here too the author has employed the best sources of information, and has seldom come short in the matter of accuracy, though he does not enter widely into details, as indeed he could not do in the space to which the nature and compass of his work necessarily confined him. We miss details for which we must look elsewhere. For instance: Less than four pages are given to the *Augsburg Confession*, and less space to the *Schmalkald League*.

Pp. 417-425 are devoted to the narrative of the Reformation in Denmark, Sweden and Norway. Only the essential facts could be given in these eight pages.

The remainder of the book discusses *The Religious Principles Inspiring the Reformation*. We are well pleased with this discussion. It is clear, discriminating and sympathetic. The author has discovered the springs of the German Reformation, and has correctly set forth its chief characteristic features. A few quotations will suffice to prove the correctness of this analysis. On p. 430: "With Luther and all the Reformers, Christ fills the whole sphere of God; they do not recognize any theology which is not Christology." On p. 431, after giving Luther's description of faith: "It is a living, busy, active, powerful thing, faith," and declaring that "Christianity is therefore an interwoven tissue of promises and prayers of faith," he says: "This conception of what is meant by Christianity is the religious soul of the Reformation. It contains within it all the distinctively religious principles which inspired it. It can scarcely be called a dogma. It is an experience, and the phrases which set it forth are the descriptions of an experience which a human soul has gone through. The thing itself is beyond exact definition—as all deep experiences are. It must be felt and gone through to be known. The Reformation started from this personal experience of the believing Christian, which is declared to be the one elemental fact in Christianity which could never be proved by argument and could never be dissolved by any speculation \* \* \* Luther proclaimed his discovery, he never attempted to prove it by argument; it was something self-evident—seen and known when experienced." P. 432. On p. 473: "With Luther all theology is really Christology." "Like Athanasius, Luther found his salvation in the Diety of Christ." "The thought of the Divinity of Christ meant more to Luther than it did to previous theologians."

Pp. 489-512 contain a *Chronological Summary of the History of the Reformation*. This is very valuable, though it needs a few corrections. P. 491: Melancthon's *Loci* of 1535 and the edition of 1543-4 contain the *same* identical doctrine of "synergism," and express that doctrine in almost the same identical words: "Three causes are united: The Word, the Holy Spirit, and the Will, not indeed inactive, but resisting its own weakness;" and: "Only will, and God anticipates;" and: "God draws, but draws him who is willing." *C. R.* 21: p. 376 and p. 658.

P. 493: Bishop of Pomesania, and not: "Bishop of Pomerania." P. 500: Luther did not attend "the Convent of Schwabach," Oct. 16, 1529; nor was he at Schmalkald, Nov. 30, of the same year. He was at home in Wittenberg at both these dates. P. 501: Protestant Convention at Schmalkald, 1537, not 1557.

On p. 364 our author says that "Melancthon was responsible for the phraseology" of the Augsburg Confession. This is only the repetition of an old anti-Philippistic defamation, though not so intended by the present author. Melancthon was as truly the author of the

Augsburg Confession as Dr. Lindsay is the author of the book before us. He conceived the purpose of changing the proposed "Apology" into a confession. He named himself the author of the Confession; his contemporaries accorded him the honor of being its author, and on the marble slab that covers his ashes in the *Schlosskirche* in Wittenberg we read: *Autor Confessionis Augustanae*. Even our author, on p. 499, speaks of the Confession as "the work of Melancthon assisted by the evangelical theologians assembled at Augsburg, and revised by Luther;" though it is not true that the Augsburg Confession was "revised by Luther." On May 11th, 1530, "the first sketch" of the Confession, yet far from being finished, was sent to Luther, who declared that it pleased him fairly well, but he did not suggest any change. He never saw any part of the Confession thereafter until some days subsequent to its delivery, June 25th.

P. 467, note, Zwingli perished on the field of battle, 1531. How could he "declare in the *First Helvetic Confession* (1536) that," etc.?

Barring thus a few slight defects we recommend this book to all who would read a good and reliable *History of the Reformation in Germany*. We anticipate both pleasure and profit from reading *The Reformation in Lands Beyond Germany*, by the same author, which, we are informed, is *in press*.

J. W. RICHARD.

*The Apostolic Age*. By James Hardy Ropes, Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Harvard University. \$1.25 net.

The historical method of viewing the literature of the New Testament has called forth numerous books on the Apostolic Age.

The growth of the early Church and the expansion of Christianity by Pauline labors secure illumination by a critical study of the origins described in the Acts.

Prof. Ropes calls himself old-fashioned enough to believe the Lucan authorship of the Acts; but it is scarcely needful to be apologetic for this traditional opinion as though in the light of modern criticism nothing traditional may be held without the suspicion of being unscholarly. But while Prof. Ropes admits Lucan authorship he deems the Book scarcely authentic history, it being much embellished by freedom of composition. He gives probability to the South Galatian theory, and identifies Acts XV with Gal. 2. He allows the view that II Thessalonians may possibly not be genuine, and also rejects the Pastoral Epistles as not being purely Pauline, but admits fragmentary Pauline elements as the basis of the composition. He regards the Epistle to the Galatians as probably composed at Antioch before Paul started on his second missionary journey, and the Epistles of the Imprisonment as written while Paul was imprisoned in Rome.

Undue caution in expressions of opinion is constantly employed by the author, manifesting a lack of personal conviction in regard to many controverted points. It is not well to be assumptive in opinion, but lack of conviction never produces conviction. One should be tentative with judicial judgment. The historical method has its certainties as well as its probabilities. Historical treatment of the New Testament fails frequently to distinguish between method and principle. Christianity is not simply a development, though it results in development; it is not merely a moral renovation, but produces that result. A thing is not to be entirely subsumed under its consequences or results; the method is not to be identified with the originating principle. Development does not account for primal cause. The historical method must see more than method, else it fails of truth. Historical method is too frequently a journey pursued by one who becomes oblivious of the port he has left, and is indifferent to the haven to which he tends; it is all journey, much unconcerned about whence or whither.

The author seems tentative and timid lest he should offend some master of method, or fail to keep step in the rank of progressive development. More judgemental and less Gamaliel temperament would give added tone to the careful presentation.

Prof. Ropes concludes his book with a chapter containing an excellent resume of the literature on the Apostolic Age. He shows himself conversant with many of the best writers in the historical treatment of the Acts, although he does not mention Ramsay, Chase, Weinel, or Clemen.

M. COOVER.

*The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament.* By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University.

This is a very interesting and instructive little volume of 270 pages. As a matter of course it is written from the standpoint of the Higher Criticism, but it is far less radical than one might expect to find it. All through the language is temperate and the spirit reverent, and the aim is evidently constructive rather than destructive. It is safe to say that if all the so-called "Higher Critics" had written in a similar spirit and strain, they would have excited much less of prejudice and done much less harm.

Professor Kent seems freely to admit a special divine inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament Scriptures. In the chapter on *The Place of the Old Testament in Divine Revelation*, page 59, he says: "In seeking the ultimate answer to our question, How were the Israelites prepared to be the chosen people, we are confronted by a miracle that baffles our power to analyze; it is the supreme fact that the Spirit of the Almighty touched the spirit of certain men in ancient Israel so that

they became seers and prophets. This is their own testimony, and their deeds and words amply confirm it."

A much earlier date is allowed also by Professor Kent to the New Testament writings than by many others of his school. In the chapter on *The Influences that Produced the New Testament* he says pages 79, 80: "Thus the second half of the first century after the death of Jesus witnessed the birth of a large Christian literature, consisting of epistles, gospels, and apocalypses. The work of the next three centuries was the appreciation and selection of the books which today constitute our New Testament."

We desire to call special attention to the last two chapters of the book on *Practical Methods of Studying the Old Testament*, and on *Religious Education*, both of which contain some valuable suggestions for the improvement of the prevailing methods of Bible study in the Sunday Schools.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY.

*Old Testament Introduction, General and Special.* By John Howard Raven, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, at New Brunswick, N. J. Pp. 362.

For too long a time the radical and destructive school of Higher Critics have been having things all their own way. No wonder they have grown presumptuous, and having undermined the integrity and authority of the Old Testament, at least in their own judgment, are now proceeding to do the same destructive work upon the New Testament. We are glad, therefore, to see signs of a reaction, at last. We are beginning to have some books on these subjects of a high character from conservative authors. This book by Dr. Raven is a notable example of this.

In the preface, Dr. Raven says that the book was written because, in his own work in the classroom, he realized the need of "a conservative text-book which covers the whole range of the subject." This need his book meets admirably. The student will find in it a clear and calm discussion of all the "burning questions" concerning the Old Testament, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the two Isaiahs, the date and authorship of the book of Daniel, &c., &c., and in all cases the conservative and traditional view is maintained and ably defended. This is not because the author has not read and duly considered the views of the radical critics, but because he has done so and has found them wanting. He shows perfect familiarity with their positions and arguments, and in most cases allows them to speak for themselves by quoting their own words. But he also shows himself entirely qualified to meet them on their own grounds, and when we remember how much noise they have made in the world, and the calm assurance with which they main-

tain their views and deride the scholarship of all who presume to differ with them, it is surprising to find how easily their arguments may be met, and the difficulties they have raised removed.

While Dr. Raven's book gives evidence of ample scholarship, the style is remarkably simple, technical terms are largely avoided, and hence it can be read understandingly by any laymen of ordinary intelligence. We commend it, therefore, not only to pastors and theological students but also to others who are interested in the subject, and especially to Sunday School teachers and other Bible students, whose minds may have been disquieted by the recent assaults upon the integrity of the Scriptures, and the oft repeated assertion that "all modern scholarship" has gone over to the ranks of radical and destructive criticism.

The publishers have done their work well. In paper, type, and binding, the volume is all that could be desired.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Licht des Lebens.* Ein Jahrgang von Evangelien Predigten aus dem Nachlass des seeligen D. Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther. 8 vo. Pp. 688.

The above is another volume of sermons from the apparently inexhaustible manuscript remains of Dr. Walther. The sermons are based on the Gospel Lessons of the Church Year, and in form and content are models of popular biblical instruction.

To those preachers, among us, who discard the pericopal system because to them it offers a too narrow field for homiletic effort, this volume, and those of a like nature which have preceded it, by the same author, ought to prove a revelation. Dr. Walther knew how to preach a pure gospel in a way to reach the masses. The sermons before us do not speak to men of a bygone age, but to men of today. They rebuke the sins of the times in which we live, and in them, the blessed gospel, freed from modern doubts and negations, stands for the building up of the Kingdom of God and the coming of the reign of the Prince of Peace.

Although a prince among dogmaticians, and one ever ready on occasion to use with full command, a sharp and incisive sword on the field of theological controversy. These sermons exhibit the other side of Dr. Walther's great nature, and present him in the light of a gentle and loving shepherd, with an all-consuming love for Christ, and a burning desire to edify the church and build up her waste places. They present the gospel in its simplicity and power in language that stirs the heart, and that at times appears matchless in doctrine and eloquence. To all who can read the German we would most earnestly commend this volume of sermons.

R. H. CLARE.



LUTHERANS IN ALL LANDS COMPANY, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

*Luther's Church Postil Gospels. Advent, Christmas and Epiphany Sermons.* Translated now for the first time into English, with introduction, Walch's Analysis and Bugenhagen's Summaries. By Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D.D., assisted by various Lutheran scholars. 8 mo. pp. 455. \$2.25.

This is the fifth volume of Luther's Works as edited by Dr. Lenker, and the tenth in the proposed series. It is uniform in style and make-up with the preceding volumes, and appeals to the eye. We again heartily commend these volumes to the English reader. Luther cannot be bound by time or translation. He is ever free and alive. His sermons flash and glow with the true light. Their simplicity is proverbial. Filled to overflowing with gospel truth they must remain edifying to the end of time.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE GRAFTON PRESS, NEW YORK.

*Some Trinitarian Forgeries*, stated by a Monotheist. 12 mo. pp. 101. \$1.00 net.

The best thing about this little book is the fine printing. The contents are a blasphemous attempt to convince the reader that the doctrine of the Trinity is "a coarse forgery perpetrated by the wilful mistranslation of the original Scriptures." The revisers, however, are in some instances more honest than the makers of the King James version, according to our Monotheist. A single quotation will suffice to show his method. "'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' How coarse the forgery is in this case will be plain when we give the following absolutely literal translation: 'In (a) beginning was the word, and the word was with the God, and the word was (a) god'."

In short, our Monotheist is a Unitarian, who spells the Godhead of Jesus with a little "g." He is a subordinationist in the line of the ancient Arius, whom the youthful Athanasius vanquished at the Council of Nice, A.D. 320. This sickly heresy of Monotheist has been nursed by rationalism through all these centuries, but has never attained any vitality, and never can. The Scriptures and all history cry out against this fearful error.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK; AND WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE, CHICAGO.

*Annotations on the General Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude and the Revelation of St. John.* By Revere F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary. Two volumes in one, pp. viii, 380; lxx., 365. \$1.75

These helpful annotations on the text of the Catholic Epistles and Revelation are preceded by plain and brief introductions to the several Books. The view as to authorship, genuineness, and the general exposition, is traditional and conservative, after examination of opposing views.

Dr. Weidner rejects the Hieronymian and Epiphanian views of the relation of James to Jesus, and accepts the Helvidian theory that the brethren of Jesus are his younger brothers, sons of Joseph and Mary. The book of James is regarded as the first New Testament writing, and composed *circa* 50 A. D.

Peter's First Epistle is accepted as written from Babylon literally interpreted, and not metaphorically from Rome. Dr. Weidner does not discuss the writing as by Peter himself, or by the hand of Sylvanus, nor the theory of Pauline likeness in the Epistle as due to Catholic Evangelism, or to the free hand of Sylvanus in penning Peter's epistolary message.

The *Elect Lady* of John is taken literally and personally, and not metaphorically. The revelation of St. John is treated in the Futurist conception, rejecting the Preterist, Historical, and Spiritual theories. The positions of the older dogmatists and exegetes are mostly adhered to in the exegesis of the text. 1 Peter 3 : 19 is held to be a proclamation of victory and judgment in Hades, and not a proffer of grace, despite the acknowledged affiliation of this verse with verse 10 of chapter 4 which is evangelistic as well as proclamatory. The good Lutheran view of 1 Peter 4 : 6 is maintained that the love which covers a multitude of sins covers the sins of the one that is loved, and not of the lover.

The theological positions of the author are visible in the annotations, and are healthy in these times of evasive treatment of Biblical conceptions and statements. Not infrequently, however, the author has allowed his theology to overawe his exegesis and to dominate his hermeneutic. It is better to hold dogma in abeyance till the exegesis is grammatically and historically established, and let doctrine be moulded accordingly. The latter is Lutheran in principle.

In the introduction to Revelation a careful list is given of the able commentaries treating the apocalypse, and describing the doctrinal position and exegetical method maintained by the various commentators.

Dr. Weidner's work is a good students' guide to the literature of the Books annotated, and is a clear and excellent Biblical treatment for the lay reader.

M. COOVER.